

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1417992



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

S
22
53913
924
V. 3-5

A HISTORY
OF
THE JEWISH PEOPLE
IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST

BY THE LATE
PROFESSOR EMIL SCHÜRER, D.D.

AUTHORISED ENGLISH TRANSLATION

COMPLETE IN TWO VOLUMES
EACH COMPRISING ONE DIVISION
(INDEX VOLUME ADDITIONAL)

SECOND DIVISION
(THREE VOLUMES IN ONE)

THE INTERNAL CONDITION OF PALESTINE, AND OF
THE JEWISH PEOPLE, IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST

VOL. I

EDINBURGH : T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

D5
122
53913
1924
v. 3-5

A HISTORY
OF
THE JEWISH PEOPLE
IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST

BY THE LATE
PROFESSOR EMIL SCHÜRER, D.D.

AUTHORISED ENGLISH TRANSLATION

COMPLETE IN TWO VOLUMES
EACH COMPRISING ONE DIVISION
(INDEX VOLUME ADDITIONAL)

SECOND DIVISION
(THREE VOLUMES IN ONE)

THE INTERNAL CONDITION OF PALESTINE, AND OF
THE JEWISH PEOPLE, IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST

VOL. I

EDINBURGH : T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH

LONDON : SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED

NEW YORK : CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

<i>Printed</i>	<i>November</i>	1885
<i>Reprinted</i>	<i>July</i>	1890
"	<i>May</i>	1892
"	<i>March</i>	1893
"	<i>January</i>	1898
"	<i>April</i>	1901
"	<i>June</i>	1904
"	<i>August</i>	1905
"	<i>August</i>	1910
"	<i>December</i>	1914
"	<i>July</i>	1922
"	<i>January</i>	1924

CONTENTS OF DIVISION II. VOL. I.

	PAGE
§ 22. THE STATE OF CULTURE IN GENERAL,	1
I. Mixture of Population, Language,	1
II. Diffusion of Hellenic Culture,	11
1. Hellenism in the Non-Jewish Regions,	11
2. Hellenism in the Jewish Region,	29
III. Position of Judaism with respect to Heathenism,	51
§ 23. CONSTITUTION. SANHEDRIM. HIGH PRIEST,	57
I. The Hellenistic Towns,	57
Raphia, 66. Gaza, 68. Anthedon, 72. Ascalon, 74.	
Azotus, 76. Jamnia, 78. Joppa, 79. Apollonia, 83.	
Straton's Tower = Caesarea, 84. Dora, 87. Ptolemais,	
90. Damascus, 96. Hippus, 98. Gadara, 100. Abila,	
104. Raphana, 106. Kanata, 106. Kanatha, 108.	
Scythopolis, 110. Pella, 113. Dium, 115. Gerasa,	
116. Philadelphia, 119. Sebaste = Samaria, 123.	
Gaba, 127. Esbon (Hesbon), 128. Antipatris, 130.	
Phasaelis, 131. Caesarea Panias, 132. Julias = Beth-	
saida, 135. Sepphoris, 136. Julias = Livias, 141.	
Tiberias, 143.	
II. The strictly Jewish Territory,	149
III. The great Sanhedrim at Jerusalem,	163
History, 165. Composition, 174. Jurisdiction, 184. Time	
and Place of Sessions, 190. Judicial Procedure, 193.	
IV. The High Priests.	195
§ 24. THE PRIESTHOOD AND THE TEMPLE WORSHIP,	207
I. The Priesthood as a distinct Order,	207
II. The Emoluments,	230
III. The Various Functions of the Priesthood,	254
IV. The Daily Service,	273
Appendix. Participation of Gentiles in the Worship at Jeru-	
salem,	299

	PAGE
§ 25. SCRIBISM,	306
I. Canonical Dignity of Holy Scripture,	306
II. The Scribes and their Activity in general,	312
III. Halachah and Haggadah,	329
1. The Halachah,	330
2. The Haggadah,	339
IV. The most famous Scribes,	351

§ 22. THE STATE OF CULTURE IN GENERAL.

I. MIXTURE OF POPULATION. LANGUAGE.

THE *Jewish population* of Palestine experienced, during the Greek and Roman period, as well as in previous centuries, great fluctuations both in numbers and extension. From the beginning of the Hellenistic period to the rising of the Maccabees the Jewish element must be regarded as gradually receding, the Greek as triumphantly advancing. The rising of the Maccabees and its consequences produced however an important change, Judaism gaining ground thereby both intensively and extensively. It was internally consolidated and extended its boundaries in nearly every direction: to the west, by the Judaizing of the towns of Gazara, Joppa and Jamnia (see above, § 7, and below, § 23. I.); to the south, by the compulsory conversion of the Idumaeans under John Hyrcanus (see § 8); to the north, by the conversion of the Ituraeans under Aristobulus I. (see § 9); and in all directions by the conquests of Alexander Jannaeus. It is true that the Judaism of these Asmonean princes from John Hyrcanus onwards was not that of the scribes and Pharisees; still they represented, though in their own fashion, the Jewish religion and nationality, as the example of the "Hellenistic Aristobulus" especially proves. Then, under Alexandra even the Pharisaic tendency again prevailed. Under the Romans and Herodians indeed the pursuit of a Graeco-Roman culture was again favoured as much as possible. But Pharisaic Judaism was now so established, both externally and internally, by the development of the last two centuries, that its state of possession could not thus be essentially encroached upon, and not till

the convulsions of the wars under Vespasian and Hadrian did it again incur great losses.

For the times of Josephus we have somewhat more accurate information concerning the extension of the Jewish population in Palestine in the description he has given of the country in his *Bell. Jud.* iii. 3.¹ From this we learn—what is elsewhere confirmed—that of all the maritime towns, two only, viz. Joppa and Jamnia, which were Judaized in the Maccabæan period, contained a chiefly Jewish population. In all the other coast towns the Gentile was the prevailing element (see also § 23. I.). In the interior, on the contrary, the countries of Judæa, Galilee and Peraea had an essentially Jewish population. To these were added the regions lying to the east of the Sea of Gennesareth, viz. Gamalitis, Gaulonitis, Batanaea and Trachonitis, which had a mixed Jewish and heathen population.

The threefold division of the Jewish region into Judæa, Galilee and Peraea (עֵבֶר הַיָּרְדֵּן, גָּלִיל, יְהוּדָה) is also repeatedly

¹ It is evident, that Josephus intends to give in the above-mentioned passage (*Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 1–5) a description of the Jewish country, i.e. of those districts of Palestine, which were entirely or chiefly inhabited by Jews. For all Gentile districts are excluded from the description and only mentioned to define the boundaries of the Jewish regions. He thus first describes Galilee, which is bounded on the west by the region of Ptolemais; on the east by that of Hippos, Gadara, etc. (iii. 3. 1); then Peraea, which is bounded on the north by the region of Pella, on the east by that of Gerasa, Philadelphia, etc. (iii. 3. 6). Hereupon follows a description of Samaria (iii. 3. 4), and finally one of Judæa (iii. 3. 5). The latter extends from the Jordan to Joppa (μέχρις Ἰόπης), Joppa being thus not reckoned as a part of Judæa. The Hellenistic coast towns are all excluded from the description; and Josephus only says of the Jewish territory that it was not deprived of those enjoyments, which come from the sea, because it extended to the coast lands (iii. 3. 5: ἀφῆρηται δὲ οὐδὲ τῶν ἐκ θαλάσσης τερπνῶν ἢ Ἰουδαία, τοῖς παραλίοις κατατείνουσα). To the four provinces mentioned, Josephus adds, by way of supplement: (1) the region of Jamnia and Joppa as being the only maritime towns of which the population was chiefly Jewish (comp. § 23. I.); and (2) the provinces of Gamalitis, Gaulonitis, Batanaea and Trachonitis, in the kingdom of Agrippa, because the Jewish element here formed at least a very considerable fraction. It is of special interest to observe, that in this whole description Josephus includes Samaria, thus evidently regarding the Samaritans also as Jews, though as heterodox Jews.

assumed in the Mishna.² The central country and nucleus of the whole was Judaea, which was bounded on the north by Samaria, on the east by the Jordan and the Dead Sea, on the west by the district of the Philistine-Hellenistic cities, on the south by Arabia Petraea. In Judaea was the centre of Jewish life; it was here that the new community had first reorganized itself after the Babylonian captivity, here that the rising of the Maccabees originated, and here that the learned and educational activity of the scribes and Pharisees had its chief seat. In the north, and separated from Judaea by Samaria, was Galilee, whose boundaries were to the north the district of Tyre; to the west, that of Ptolemais; to the east, Jordan and the Lake of Gennesareth. The population of Galilee also was mainly Jewish; for the inhabitants of this district had not joined the Samaritan schism, as might have been expected from the former common history of the kingdom of Ephraim. On the contrary, the tendency adopted by Judaism in the post-exilic period had been—we no longer know how or when, but certainly during the Persian period—successfully brought to bear in this district also, and an enduring religious association thus established between the inhabitants of Judaea and Galilee. Peraea, the third of the Jewish lands, lay beyond the river Jordan, and was bounded on the north by the district of Pella, on the east by the districts of Gerasa, Philadelphia, and Heshbon, and on the south by the kingdom of Arabia Petraea. In this province also the population was an essentially Jewish one.³ Still, neither in Galilee nor Peraea must we conceive of the Jewish element as pure and unmixed. In the shifting course of history Jews and Gentiles had here been so often, and in such a variety of ways, thrown

² *Shebiith* ix. 2; *Kethuboth* xiii. 10; *Baba bathra* iii. 2.

³ Comp. e.g. *Antt.* xx. 1. 1 (the dispute of the Jews with the Philadelphians concerning boundaries); *Bell. Jud.* iv. 7. 4-6 (the share of the Jews of Peraea in the revolt). The Mishna too always assumes, that Peraea (עֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן) is a land inhabited by Jews; see *Shebiith* ix. 2; *Bikkurim* i. 10; *Taanith* iii. 6; *Kethuboth* xiii. 10; *Baba bathra* iii. 2; *Edujoth* viii. 7; *Menachoth* viii. 3.

together, that the attainment of exclusive predominance by the Jewish element must be counted among the impossibilities. It was only in Judaea, that this was at least approximately arrived at by the energetic agency of the scribes during the course of a century.

In spite of the common religion and nationality of the three provinces, many differences of manners and customs existed between their inhabitants, and these imparted a certain independence to their inner life, quite apart from the political separation repeatedly appearing. The Mishna mentions, *e.g.*, slight differences in respect of the marriage laws between Judaea and Galilee,⁴ varying customs in the intercourse between espoused persons,⁵ differences of weights and coinage between Judaea and Galilee.⁶ The three provinces are therefore looked upon as in certain respects "different countries."⁷

The districts east of the Lake of Gennesareth (Gamalitis, Gaulonitis, Batanaea and Trachonitis) formed a somewhat motley assemblage. The population was a mixed one of Jews and Syrians (*Bell. Jud.* iii. 5: οἰκοῦσι δὲ αὐτὴν μυγάδες Ἰουδαῖοι τε καὶ Σύροι). But besides the settled population, numerous nomadic hosts, from whom the former had much to suffer, were wandering about in these border lands of civilisation. Very favourable to them were the caves of this district, in which they could lay up stores of water and provisions, and in case of attack find refuge, together with their flocks and herds. Hence it was very difficult to subdue them. The powerful hand of Herod however succeeded in inducing among them a certain amount of order.⁸ With the view of keeping these turbulent elements permanently in check, he frequently settled foreign colonists in Trachonitis; at first, three thousand Idumaeans;⁹ then a colony of warlike Jews from Babylon, to

⁴ *Kethuboth* iv. 12.

⁵ *Jebamoth* iv. 10; *Kethuboth* i. 5

⁶ *Terumoth* x. 8; *Kethuboth* v. 9; *Chullin* xi. 2.

⁷ *E.g.* in respect of the fundamental principle, that the wife is not bound to accompany her husband to another country (*Kethuboth* xiii. 10), in respect of the law of usucaption (*Baba bathra* iii. 2).

⁸ *Antt.* xv. 10. 1.

⁹ *Antt.* xvi. 9. 2.

whom he granted the privilege of immunity from taxation.¹⁰ His sons and grandson continued this work. Nevertheless one of the two Agrippas had to complain in an edict of the brutish manner of life (*θηριώδης κατάσταση*) of the inhabitants and of their abode in the caves.¹¹ Herod's exertions for the promotion of culture at last introduced the Greek element into these countries. In the neighbourhood of Kanatha (see § 23. I.) are still found the ruins of a temple, which according to its Greek inscriptions belongs to the period of Herod the Great.¹² Greek inscriptions of the two Agrippas, especially of Agrippa II., are found in larger numbers in the neighbourhood of Hauran.¹³ In the Roman period the Greek element predominated, at least externally, in these districts (see hereon Nr. ii. 1).

The *Samaritans* also belonged in a wider sense to the Jewish population.¹⁴ For their character is not rightly viewed

¹⁰ *Antt.* xvii. 2. 1-3. On the history of this colony, comp. also *Vita*, 11.

¹¹ The unfortunately very scanty fragments of this edict are given in Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines*, vol. iii. n. 2329. Thence also in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1873, p. 252.

¹² Comp. especially the inscriptions in Le Bas and Waddington, vol. iii. n. 2364.

¹³ Le Bas and Waddington, vol. iii. n. 2112, 2135, 2211, 2329, 2365, 2413^b. Thence also in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1873, p. 248 sqq.

¹⁴ Kautzsch gives in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 2nd ed. xiii. 351-355, the most complete catalogue of the copious literature on the Samaritans. Comp. especially: Cellarius, *Collectanea historiae Samaritanae*, 1688 (also in Ugolini, *Thes.* t. xxii.); Robinson's *Palestine*, iii. 130, 131; Juynboll, *Commentarii in historiam gentis Samaritanæ*, Lugd. Bat. 1846; Winer, *RWB.* ii. 369-373; Lutterbeck, *Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, i. 255-269; Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 580 sqq.; Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums*, i. 44-89; Petermann in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. xiii. 359-391. Hausrath, *Zeitgesch.*, 2nd ed. i. 12-23; Schrader in Schenkel's *Bibellexicon*, v. 149-154; Appel, *Quæstiones de rebus Samaritanorum sub imperio Romanorum peractis*, Gotting. 1874; Nutt, *A Sketch of Samaritan History, Dogma, and Literature*, London 1874; Kohn, "Zur Sprache," "Literatur und Dogmatik des Samaritaner" (articles in the *Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. v. No. iv. 1876); Kautzsch in Riehm's *Handwörterbuch des bibl. Altertums*, sub voce; Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments*, § 381, 382; Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, div. ii. 1883, pp. 1062-1071; Kautzsch in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*,

till it is regarded from the twofold point of sight—(1) of their being indeed, according to their *natural* composition, a mixed people arising from the intermingling of the former Israelitish population with Gentile elements, especially with the heathen colonists introduced by the Assyrians; and (2) of their having a *religion* essentially identical with that of Israel at an earlier stage of development. Among the colonists, whom the Assyrians had planted (2 Kings xvii. 24 sqq.) in Samaria from the provinces of Babylon, Cuthah, Ava, Hamath and Sepharvaim, those from Cuthah (כּוּתִי, כּוּתִי, 2 Kings xvii. 24, 30) seem to have been particularly numerous. The inhabitants of Samaria were hence subsequently called Cuthites by the Jews (*Χουθαῖοι* in Joseph. *Antt.* ix. 14. 3, xi. 4. 4, 7. 2, xiii. 9. 1; in Rabbinic literature כּוּתִיִּים^{14a}). We must not, however, confidently assume, that the ancient Israelitish population was entirely carried away, and the whole country peopled afresh by these heathen colonists. It is, on the contrary, certain, that a considerable percentage of the ancient population remained, and that the new population consisted of a mixture of these with the heathen immigrants. The religion of this mingled people was, according to the Bible (2 Kings xvii. 24–41), at first a mixed religion,—a combination of the heathen rites introduced by the colonists with the old Israelite worship of Jahveh upon the high places. Gradually however the Israelitish religion must have obtained a decided preponderance. For, from what we know with certainty of the religion of the Samaritans (of course leaving malicious reports out of question), it was a pure Israelitish monotheism. They acknowledged the unity of God and the authority of Moses as the greatest of the prophets; they

2nd ed. xiii. 340–355. Various contributions to the Samaritan literature by Heidenheim in the *deutschen Vierteljahrsschrift für engl.-theol. Forschung und Kritik*, 1861 sqq.

^{14a} כּוּתִיִּים in the Mishna in the following places: *Berachoth* vii. 1, viii. 8; *Pea* ii. 7; *Demai* iii. 4, v. 9, vi. 1, vii. 4; *Terumoth* iii. 9; *Challa* iv. 7; *Shekalim* i. 5; *Rosh hashana* ii. 2; *Kethuboth* iii. 1; *Nedarim* iii. 10; *Gittin* i. 5; *Kiddushin* iv. 3; *Ohaloth* xvii. 3; *Tohoroth* v. 8; *Nidda* iv 1, 2, vii. 3, 4, 5.

observed the Jewish rite of circumcision on the eighth day, the sanctification of the Sabbath, and the Jewish annual festivals. Nay, they even relinquished the pre-Deuteronomic standpoint of the worship of Jahveh upon high places, accepted the whole Pentateuch as the law of Israel, and consequently acknowledged the unity of the Jewish worship. It is only in the circumstance of their transferring this worship not to Jerusalem but to Gerizim that we perceive the after effect of the older standpoint. Here, according to the somewhat suspicious account of Josephus, they built in the time of Alexander the Great¹⁵ a temple of their own; and even after its destruction by John Hyrcanus, Gerizim continued to be their sacred mountain and the seat of their worship.¹⁶ They did not indeed participate in the further development of Pharisaic Judaism, but rejected all that went beyond the injunctions of the Pentateuch. Nor did they accept any of the sacred writings of the Jewish canon except the Pentateuch. But for all this the right to call themselves "Israelites" cannot be denied them, so far, that is, as religion and not descent is in question.

The position of Judaism proper with regard to the Samaritans was always a hostile one: the ancient antagonism of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah was here carried on in a new form. When the Samaritans desired, in the time of Zerubbabel, to co-operate in the building of the temple at Jerusalem, they were rejected by the Jews (Ezra iv. 1); and "the foolish people who dwell in Sichem" are as much hated by the Son of Sirach as the Edomites and Philistines (Ecclus. l. 25, 26). The Samaritans on their side requited this disposition with like hostility.¹⁷ The legal appointments, never-

¹⁵ Josephus, *Antt.* xi. 7. 2; 8. 2 sqq. The history of Sanballat and his son-in-law, with which Josephus connects the building of the temple on Gerizim, happened according to Nehemiah's account in his own days (Neh. xiii. 28), about one hundred years before Alexander the Great.

¹⁶ Destruction by John Hyrcanus, *Antt.* xiii. 9. 1. Continuance of veneration for it: John iv. 20; Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 4. 1; *Bell. Jud.* iii. 7. 32.

¹⁷ Neh. iv. 1 sqq.; Luke ix. 52, 53; Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 2. 2, xx. 6. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 12. 3; *Rosh hashana* ii. 2.

theless, of Rabbinic Judaism with respect to the Samaritans, are, from the standpoint of Pharisaism, generally correct and just.¹⁸ The Samaritans are never absolutely treated as "foreigners," but as a mingled people, whose Israelitish descent was not indeed proved, but always to be regarded as possible.¹⁹ Hence their membership of "the congregation of Israel" is not denied, but only designated as doubtful.²⁰ Their observance of the law, *e.g.* with regard to tithes and the Levitical laws of purification, did not indeed correspond with Pharisaic requirements, on which account they were in many respects placed on a level with Gentiles.²¹ They were never however treated as idolaters (עב'ים), but, on the contrary, decidedly distinguished from them.²² Their observance of the Sabbath is occasionally mentioned,²³ and it is assumed as at least possible, that they could say a genuine Israelitish grace at meals.²⁴ In fact they stand, so far as their observance of the law is concerned, on the same level as the Sadducees.²⁵

The *language* of the Jewish population of all the districts

¹⁸ A collection of Rabbinical definitions is given in the treatise כותרים, in the seven small treatises published by Raphael Kirchheim (see above, § 3); the passages of the Mishna (see above, note 14^a); comp. also Lightfoot, *Centuria Matthæo præmissa*, c. 56 (*Opp.* ii. 212); Hamburger, as before quoted.

¹⁹ Compare, on the one hand, *Shekalim* i. 5 (obligatory sacrifices for the temple are to be received only from Israelites, not from Gentiles nor even from Samaritans); on the other, *Berachoth* vii. 1 (when three Israelites have eaten together, they are bound to prepare themselves formally for prayer; this also holds good if one of the three is a Samaritan); *Kethuboth* iii. 1 (the claim for a money compensation on account of cohabitation with an Israelitish virgin holds good in respect of a Samaritan virgin).

²⁰ *Kiddushin* iv. 3.

²¹ Comp. in general, *Demai* vii. 4; *Tohoroth* v. 8; *Nidda* iv. 1, 2, vii. 3-5.

²² *Berachoth* vii. 1; *Demai* iii. 4, v. 9, vi. 1; *Terumoth* iii. 9. The assertion, that the Samaritans worshipped the image of a dove, is a slander first appearing in the Talmud (*Jer. Aboda sara* v. fol. 44^a; *Bab. Chullin* 6^a; see Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterbuch*, s.v. דב'ה), and one, of which the Mishna as yet knows nothing.

²³ *Nedarim* iii. 10.

²⁴ *Berachoth* viii. 8.

²⁵ Comp. *Nidda* iv. 2: "The Sadducees, when they follow the customs of their fathers, are equal to the Samaritans." Epiphanius says of the Sadducees, *Haer.* 14: τὰ πάντα δὲ ἴσα Σαμαρειταῖς φυλάττουσιν.

here mentioned was, since the last centuries before Christ, no longer Hebrew, but Aramaic.²⁶ How and when the change was effected, cannot now be ascertained. At any rate, it was not the exiles, who returned from Babylon, who brought the Aramaic thence, for the post-exilian literature of the Israelites is also chiefly Hebrew. Nor was the Aramaic dialect of Palestine the Eastern (Babylonian), but the Western Aramaic. Hence it must have penetrated gradually to Palestine from the north. The period of the transition is marked by the canonical books of Ezra and Daniel (the latter about 167–165 B.C.), which are written partly in Hebrew, partly in Aramaic (Aramaic are Ezra iv. 8–6, 18, vii. 12–26; Dan. ii. 4–7, 28). A saying of Joses ben Joëser, about the middle of the second century before Christ, is cited in Aramaic in the Mishna,²⁷ also certain sayings of Hillel and other authorities.²⁸ That Aramaic was in the time of Christ the sole popular language of Palestine, is evident from the words mentioned in the New Testament: ἀββᾶ (Mark xiv. 36), ἀκελδαμάχ (Acts i. 19), γαββαθᾶ (John xix. 13), γολγοθᾶ (Matt. xxvii. 33), ἐφθαθά (Mark vii. 34), κορβανᾶς (Matt. xxvii. 6), μαμωνᾶς (Matt. vi. 24), μαρὰν ἀθά (1 Cor. xvi. 22), Μεσσίας = משיח (John i. 41), πᾶσχα (Matt. xxvi. 17), ῥακά (Matt. v. 22), σατανᾶς (Matt. xvi. 23), ταλιθὰ κούμι (Mark v. 41); to which may be added names of persons, such as Κηφᾶς, Μάρθα, Ταβιθά,²⁹ and the numerous names compounded with בַּר (Barabbas, Bartholomew, Barjesus, Barjonas, Barnabas, Barsabas, Bartimæus). The words, too, of Christ upon the

²⁶ Comp. Zung, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (1832), p. 7 sq.; Herzfeld, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, iii. 44 sqq., 58 sqq.; Böhl, *Forschungen nach einer, Volksbibel zur Zeit Jesu* (1873), pp. 4–28; Delitzsch, *Ueber die palästinische Volkssprache, welche Jesu und seine Jünger geredet haben* (“*Saat auf Hoffnung*”), 1874, pp. 195–210; Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Neuen Testaments*, § 40; the same, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments*, § 416, 417; Kautzsch, *Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (1884), pp. 4–12.

²⁷ *Edujoth* viii. 4.

²⁸ Hillel, *Aboth* i. 13, ii. 6; others, *Aboth* v. 22, 23.

²⁹ The accentuation in our editions is very inconsistent. Consistent accentuation would require ῥακά, ταλιθᾶ, Ταβιθᾶ.

cross: 'Ελωτ̄ ἐλωτ̄ λαμὰ σαβαχθανεί (Mark xv. 34), are Aramaic. Hebrew was so little current with the common people, that the lessons from the Bible read in public worship had to be translated verse by verse into the dialect of the country.³⁰ Notwithstanding however this complete prevalence of Aramaic, Hebrew still remained in use as "the sacred language" (שְׁכֵנִי הַקֹּדֶשׁ). It was read aloud in the synagogues of Palestine both before and after the Holy Scriptures; and in certain liturgical cases the use of Hebrew was absolutely required.³¹ Hebrew also continued to be the language of the learned, in which even the legal discussions of the scribes were carried on. Not until about the third century after Christ do we find Aramaic in use for the last-named purpose; and while the Mishna was still in Hebrew (second century), the Palestinian Talmud was (fourth century) in Aramaic. The latter is our most copious source for the knowledge of this language of Palestine. Some hints concerning dialectic differences of pronunciation between Judaea and Galilee are given in the Gospels and the Talmud.³²

³⁰ *Megilla* iv. 4, 6, 10. Comp. below, § 27.

³¹ *Jebamoth* xii. 6; *Sota* vii. 2-4, viii. 1, ix. 1; *Megilla* i. 8. See especially *Sota* vii. 2: "The following portions are delivered in the sacred language alone: the section of Scripture at the offering of the first-fruits, the formula at the Chaliza, the blessings and curses, the blessing of the priest, the form of blessing of the high priest, the portion read by the king (at the Feast of Tabernacles in the Sabbatic year), the formula at the killing of a calf (on account of one found dead), and the speech of one anointed for war when addressing the army." On the other hand, e.g. the Shma, the Shmone-Esre (see on this, § 27, Appendix), grace at meals, etc., might be said in any language (*Sota* vii. 1). All this applies to oral delivery. In writing, the use of Hebrew was required for the text of the *Tefillin* and *Mesusoth*; for all besides, even for the Scriptures, any language was allowed, according, however, to Rabban Gamaliel, only Greek beside Hebrew for the latter (*Megilla* i. 8). The formula for the writing of divorcement was usually, according to R. Juda, Aramaic (*Gittin* ix. 3), but might also be Greek (*Gittin* ix. 8).

³² Matt. xxvi. 20, 73, and its interpreters—Buxtorf, *Lex. s.v.* גָּלִילָא, col. 434 sqq.; Lightfoot, *Centuria chorograph. Matthaeo praemissa*, c. 87 (*Opp.* ii. 232 sq.); Morinus, *Exercitationes biblicae* (1699), ii. 18. 2, p. 514 sqq.; Aug. Pfeiffer, *Decas selecta exercitationum sacrarum*, pp. 206-216 (in the Appendix to his *Dubia vexata script. sacrae*, Leipsic and Frankfort 1685);

II. DIFFUSION OF HELLENIC CULTURE.

1. *Hellenism in the Non-Jewish Regions.*

The Jewish region just described was, in ancient times as well as in the Graeco-Roman period, surrounded on all sides by heathen districts. Only at Jamnia and Joppa had the Jewish element advanced as far as the sea. Elsewhere, even to the west, it was not the sea, but the Gentile region of the Philistine and Phenician cities, that formed the boundary of the Jewish. These heathen lands were far more deeply penetrated by Hellenism, than the country of the Jews. No reaction like the rising of the Maccabees had here put a stop to it, besides which heathen polytheism was adapted in quite a different manner from Judaism for blending with Hellenism. While therefore the further advance of Hellenism was obstructed by religious barriers in the interior of Palestine, it had attained here, as in all other districts since its triumphant entry under Alexander the Great, its natural preponderance over Oriental culture. Hence, long before the commencement of the Roman period, the educated world, especially in the great cities in the west and east of Palestine, was, we may well say, completely Hellenized. It is only with the lower strata of the populations and the dwellers in rural districts, that this must not be equally assumed. Besides however the border lands, the Jewish districts in the interior of Palestine were occupied by Hellenism, especially Scythopolis (see § 23. I. Nr. 19) and the town of Samaria, where Macedonian colonists had already been planted by Alexander the Great (§ 23. I. Nr. 24), while the national Samaritans had their central point at Sichem.

The victorious penetration of Hellenistic culture is most plainly and comprehensively shown by the *religious worship*. The native religions, especially in the Philistine and Phenician cities, did indeed in many respects maintain themselves in

Wetstein, *Nov. Test.* on Matt. xxvi. 73; Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, p. 184 sq. Further, older literature in Wolf, *Curae phil. in Nov. Test.* on Matt. xxvi. 73.

their essential character; but still in such wise, that they were transformed by and blended with Greek elements. But besides these the purely Greek worship also gained an entrance, and in many places entirely supplanted the former. Unfortunately our sources of information do not furnish us the means of separating the Greek period proper from the Roman, the best are afforded by coins, and these for the most part belong to the Roman. On the whole however the picture, which we obtain, holds good for the pre-Roman period also, nor are we entirely without direct notices of this age.

On the coins of Raphia of the times of the empire are seen especially *Apollo* and *Artemis* according to the purely Greek conception; ³³ upon those of Anthedon, on the contrary, the tutelary goddess of the city is conceived of as *Astarte*.³⁴

Of the worship at Gaza in the times of the Roman Empire complete information is given in the life of Porphyry, Bishop of Gaza, by Marcus Diaconus. According to this, there were in Gaza in the time of Porphyry (the end of the fourth century after Christ) eight *δημόσιοι ναοί*, viz. of Helios, Aphrodite, Apollo, Persephone (Kore), Hecate, Heroon, a temple of Tyche, and one of Marnas.³⁵ From this it appears that the purely Greek worship was the prevailing one, and this is confirmed in general by the coins, upon which other than Grecian deities also appear.³⁶ A temple of Apollo in

³³ Mionnet, *Description de médailles antiques*, v. 551 sq.; *Supplement*, viii. 376 sq. De Saulcy, *Numismatique de la Terre Sainte* (1874), pp. 237–240, pl. xii. n. 7–9. Stark, *Gaza*, p. 584.

³⁴ Mionnet, v. 522 sqq.; *Suppl.* viii. 364. De Saulcy, pp. 234–236, pl. xii. n. 2–4. Stark, p. 594.

³⁵ *Marci Diaconi Vita Porphyrii episcopi Gazensis*, ed. Haupt (Essays of the Berlin Academy, formerly known only in the Latin translation), c. 64: ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ναοὶ εἰδώλων δημοσίοι ὀκτώ, τοῦ τε Ἡλίου καὶ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης καὶ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ τῆς Κόρης καὶ τῆς Ἑκάτης καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον Ἡρῶν καὶ τὸ τῆς Τύχης τῆς πόλεως, ὃ ἐκάλουν Τυχαῖον, καὶ τὸ Μαρνεῖον, ὃ ἔλεγον εἶναι τοῦ Κρηταγενοῦς Διός, ὃ ἐνόμιζον εἶναι ἐνδοξότερον πάντων τῶν ἱερῶν τῶν ἀπανταχοῦ. The Marneion is also mentioned in many other passages of this work.

³⁶ Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* iii. 448 sqq. Mionnet, v. 533–549; *Suppl.* viii. 371–375. De Saulcy, pp. 209–233, pl. xi. Stark, *Gaza*, pp. 583–589.

Gaza is already mentioned at the time of the destruction of the city by Alexander Jannaeus (*Antt.* xiii. 13. 3). In the Roman period only the chief deity of the city, Marnas, was, as his name (מ = Lord) implies, originally a Shemitic deity, who was however more or less disguised in a Greek garment.³⁷

A mixture of native and Greek worship is also found at Ascalon. A chief worship here was that of 'Αφροδίτη οὐρανίη, i.e. of Astarte as Queen of Heaven. She is mentioned even by Herodotus as the deity of Ascalon, and is still represented on coins of the imperial epoch chiefly as the tutelary goddess of the town.³⁸ With her is connected, nay probably at first identical, the *Atargatis* or *Derceto*, which was worshipped at Ascalon under a peculiar form (that of a woman with a fish's tail). Her Semitic name (תתרת, compounded of תת = Astarte, and תת) already points out that she is "merely the Syrian form of Astarte blended with another deity" (Baudissin). From this fish-form it is evident, that "the fertilizing power of water" was especially honoured in her.³⁹ Asclepius λεοντοῦχος

³⁷ Comp. on Marnas besides the passages in Marcus Diaconus, Steph. Byz. s.v. Γάζα· ἔνθεν καὶ τὸ τοῦ Κρηταίου Διὸς παρ' αὐτοῖς εἶναι, ὃν καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐκάλουν Μαρναῖν, ἐρμηνευόμενον Κρηταγενῆ. Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* iii. 450 sq. Stark, *Gaza*, pp. 576–580. The oldest express testimony to the cult of Marnas are coins of Hadrian with the superscription Μαρνα; see Mionnet, v. 539. De Saulcy, pp. 216–218, pl. xi. n. 4. His cult is also met with beyond Gaza. Comp. the inscription of Kanata in Le Bas and Waddington, *Inscriptions*, vol. iii. n. 2412g (Wetstein, n. 183): Διὶ Μάρνα τῷ κυρίῳ. With the worship of Marnas as Ζεὺς Κρηταγενῆς is also connected the later Greek legend, that Gaza was also called Μίνωα, after Minos (Steph. Byz. s.v. Γάζα and s.v. Μίνωα). Comp. Stark, *Gaza*, p. 580 sq.

³⁸ Herodotus, i. 105. The coins in Mionnet, v. 523–533; *Suppl.* viii. 365–370. De Saulcy, pp. 178–208, pl. ix. and x., and comp. Stark, pp. 258 sq., 590 sq. The identity of the Grecian Aphrodite with Astarte is universally acknowledged. Perhaps even the names are identical; Aphthoreth and thence Aphroteth might, as Hommel conjectures, have arisen from Ashtoreth (Fleckeisen's *Jahrbucher für class. Philologie*, 1882, p. 176).

³⁹ On the worship of Derceto in Ascalon, see especially Strabo, xvi. p. 785; Plinius, *Hist. Nat.* v. 23. 81; Lucian, *De Syria dea*, c. 14; Ovid, *Metam.* iv. 44–46. The Semitic name upon a Palmyrian inscription and some coins (see Baudissin, and on the coins very fully Six in the

of Ascalon, to whom the Neo-Platonist Proclus composed a hymn, is, as well as these two, to be regarded as an originally Oriental deity.⁴⁰ The genuinely Greek deities Zeus, Poseidon, Apollo, Helios, Athene, etc., appear also on the coins of Ascalon.⁴¹ A temple of Apollo in Ascalon is mentioned in pre-Herodian times, the grandfather of Herod having been, it is said, Hierodule there.⁴²

In *Azotus*, the ancient Ashdod, there was in the pre-Maccabæan period a temple of the Philistine Dagon, who was formerly also worshipped at Gaza and Ascalon.⁴³ At the conquest of Ashdod by Jonathan Maccabæus, this temple was destroyed, and the heathen worship in general extirpated (1 Macc. x. 84, xi. 4). Of its re-establishment at the restoration by Gabinius no particulars are known. In any case Azotus also had in this later period a considerable number of Jewish inhabitants (see § 23. I. Nr. 5).

In the neighbouring towns of Jamnia and Joppa the Jewish element attained the preponderance after the Maccabæan age. Joppa is nevertheless of importance to Hellenism,

Numismatic Chronicle, 1878, p. 103 sqq.). With the worship of Derceto was connected the religious honour paid to the dove in Ascalon, on which comp. Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 646 (from Philo's work, *de providentia*, in Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* viii. 14. 16, ed. Gaisford; from the Armenian in Aucher, *Philonis Judæi sermones tres*, etc., p. 116). On the literature, the article of Baudissin in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 2nd ed. i. 736-740, is worthy of special mention. To the list here given of the literature must be added the article on "Derceto the Goddess of Ascalon," in the *Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record*, new series, vol. vii. 1865, pp. 1-20. Ed. Meyer, *Zeitschr. der DMG.* 1877, p. 730 sqq. Six, *Monnaies d'Hierapolis en Syrie* (*Numismatic Chronicle*, vol. xviii. 1878, pp. 103-131, and pl. vi.). Rayet, *Dédicace à la déesse Atergatis* (*Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, vol. iii. 1879, pp. 406-408). The inscription found in Astypalia and given here runs thus: *Αντισχος και Ευπορος Αταργατειτι ανεθηκαν*. Atargatis occurs only three times besides in Greek inscriptions. *Corp. inscr. Graec.* n. 7046. Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscriptions*, t. iii. n. 1890, 2588.

⁴⁰ Stark, *Gaza*, pp. 591-593.

⁴¹ See the coins in Mionnet and De Saulcy, as above. Stark, p. 589.

⁴² Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* i. 6. 2; 7. 11.

⁴³ See on this temple, Baudissin in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 2nd ed. iii. 460-463, and the literature there cited.

as the scene of the myth of Perseus and Andromeda; it was here on the rock of Joppa, that Andromeda was exposed to the monster and delivered by Perseus.⁴⁴ The myth retained its vitality even during the period of Jewish preponderance. In the year 58 B.C., at the splendid games given by M. Scaurus as aedile, the skeleton of the sea-monster brought to Rome from Joppa by Scaurus was exhibited.⁴⁵ The permanence of the myth in this locality is testified by Strabo, Mela, Pliny, Josephus, Pausanias, nay even by Jerome.⁴⁶ The Hellenistic legend, according to which Joppa is said to have been founded by Cepheus, the father of Andromeda, also points to it.^{46a} Pliny even speaks of a worship of the Ceto there,⁴⁷ and Mela of altars with the name of Cepheus and his brother Phineus as existing at Joppa.^{47a} After Joppa was destroyed as a Jewish town in the war of Vespasian, the heathen worship regained the ascendancy there.⁴⁸

In *Caesarea*, which was first raised to a considerable city by Herod the Great, we meet first of all with that worship of *Augustus* and of *Rome*, which characterized the Roman

⁴⁴ The earliest mention of Joppa as the place of this occurrence is found in Scylax (four centuries B.C.). See Müller, *Geogr. gr. minores*, i. 79; comp. in general, Stark, p. 255 sqq., 593 sq.

⁴⁵ Plinius, *Hist. Nat.* ix. 5. 11: Beluae, cui dicebatur exposita fuisse Andromeda, ossa Romæ adportata ex oppido Judaeae Jope ostendit inter reliqua miracula in aedilitate sua M. Scaurus longitudine pedum xl., altitudine costarum Indicos elephantos excedente, spinæ crassitudine sesquipedali. On Scaurus, comp. the review of the Roman Proconsuls of Syria in vol. i. On the time of his aedileship, Pauly's *Encycl.* i. 1, 2nd ed. p. 372.

⁴⁶ Strabo, xvi. p. 759; Mela, 11; Plinius, v. 13. 69, Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iii. 9. 3; Pausanias, iv. 35. 6; Hieronymus, *Comment. ad Jon.* i. 3 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, vi. 394). Most make mention, that traces of Andromeda's chains were seen on the rock at Joppa.

^{46a} Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἰόππῃ.

⁴⁷ Plinius, v. 13. 69: Colitur illic fabulosa Ceto. The name Ceto is indeed only a Latinizing of κῆτος (sea-monster); comp. Stark, p. 257.

^{47a} Mela, i. 11: ubi Cephea regnasse eo signo accolæ adfirmant, quod titulum ejus fratrisque Phinei veteres quaedam arae cum religione plurima retinent.

⁴⁸ Comp. in general the coins in Mionnet, v. 499; De Saulcy, p. 176 sq. pl. ix. n. 3, 4.

period. Provinces, towns and princes then vied with each other in the practice of this cult, which was indeed prudently declined by Augustus in Rome, but looked upon with approval and promoted in the provinces.⁴⁹ It was self-evident that Herod also could not remain behind in this matter. If a general remark of Josephus is to be taken literally, he "founded Caesarea (*Καίσαρεια*, i.e. temples of Cæsar) in many towns."⁵⁰ Such are specially mentioned in Samaria, Panias (see below) and in Caesarea. The magnificent temple here lay upon a hill opposite the entrance of the harbour. Within it stood two large statues, one of Augustus after the model of the Olympic Zeus, and one of Rome after that of Hera of Argos, for Augustus only permitted his worship in combination with that of Rome.⁵¹ With respect to the other worships of Caesarea, the coins show a motley variety. In saying this we must certainly take into consideration, that

⁴⁹ Tacit. *Annal.* i. 10, Augustus is reproached nihil deorum honoribus relictum, cum se templis et effigie numinum per flamines et sacerdotes coliveret. Sueton. *Aug.* 59: provinciarum pleraeque super templa et aras ludos quoque quinquennales paene oppidatim constituerunt. Only in Rome did Augustus decline this worship (Sueton. *Aug.* 52: in urbe quidem pertinacissime abstinuit hoc honore): a temple was first erected for it there by Tiberius (Tacit. *Annal.* vi. 45; Sueton. *Calig.* 21). Among the temples to Augustus, which have been preserved, the most celebrated is that at Ancyra, on which comp. Perrot, *Exploration archéologique de la Galatie et de la Bithynie*, etc. (1872), pp. 295–312, planche 13–31. Compare in general on the worship of the emperor, Preller, *Römische Mythologie*, p. 770 sqq.; Boissier, *La religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins* (2nd ed. 1878), i. pp. 109–186; Kuhn, *Die städt. und bürgerl. Verfassung des röm. Reichs*, i. 112; Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. iii. (1878) p. 144 sqq., and vol. i. (2nd ed. 1881) p. 503 sqq.; Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscript.* vol. iii. Illustrations to n. 885; Perrot as above, p. 295; Marquardt, *De provinciarum Romanarum conciliis et sacerdotibus* (*Ephemeris epigraphica*), i. 1872, pp. 200–214; Desjardins, *Le culte des Divi et le culte de Rome et d'Auguste* (*Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes*), nouv. serie, iii. 1879, pp. 33–63. I am only acquainted with the latter from Bursian's *philolog. Jahresber.* xix. 620–622.

⁵⁰ *Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 4; comp. *Antt.* xv. 9. 5.

⁵¹ Sueton. *Aug.* 52: templa . . . in nulla tamen provincia nisi communi suo Romaeque nomine recepit. On the temple at Caesarea, Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 7; *Antt.* xv. 9. 6. Philo also mentions the Σεβαστείον, see *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 38 *fin.*, ed. Mang. ii. 590, *fin.* The remains of a temple have also

these belong for the most part to the second and third centuries, which is of importance in the case of Caesarea, because after the time of Vespasian the Roman element, in opposition to the Greek, received a considerable reinforcement in the Roman colony introduced into Caesarea by that emperor. Hence it is to be ascribed to the influence of the Roman element, that the Egyptian Serapis, who was, as is well known, highly honoured in Rome, occurs so very frequently. In general, however, we may transpose to an earlier period also the deities mentioned on the coins. We here find again Zeus, Poseidon, Apollo, Herakles, Dionysos, Athene, Nike, and of female deities chiefly Astarte, according to the view of her prevailing in Palestine.⁵²

The coins of *Dora*, which are assignable to a period subsequent to Caligula, have most frequently the image of Zeus with the laurel.⁵³ In a narrative of Apion, which is indeed a silly fiction, Apollo is designated the *deus Dorensium*.⁵⁴ His worship, which was common in all these towns (comp. Raphia, Gaza, Ascalon, Caesarea), is to be traced to Seleucid influence. For Apollo was the ancestral God of the Seleucids, as Dionysos was that of the Ptolemies.⁵⁵

The ancient *Ptolemais* (Akko) was in the age of the Seleucids and Ptolemies one of the most flourishing of heathen cities (see § 23. I. Nr. 11). Hence we may here assume, even without more special information, an early

been discovered in Caesarea by the recent researches of Englishmen (*The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, ii. 13 sqq., with plan of the town, p. 15). It must, however, remain uncertain whether they are those of the temple of Augustus.

⁵² Mionnet, v. 486–497; *Suppl.* viii. 334–343. Serapis very often. Zeus, n. 53; *Suppl.* n. 43. Poseidon, n. 38. Apollo, n. 6, 12, 13; *Suppl.* n. 7, 12, 15. Herakles, n. 16. Dionysos, n. 37, 54, 56. Athene, *Suppl.* n. 37. Nike, n. 4; *Suppl.* n. 6, 8, 20. Astarte, n. 1, 2, 7, 18, 24, 51; *Suppl.* n. 9, 10, 11, 45. Still more in De Sauley, pp. 112–141, pl. vii.

⁵³ Mionnet, v. 359–362; *Suppl.* viii. 258–260. De Sauley, pp. 142–148, pl. vi. n. 6–12. Comp. also Eckhel, iii. 362 sq.

⁵⁴ Joseph. *contra Apion.* ii. 9.

⁵⁵ Stark, *Gaza*, p. 568 sqq.

penetration of the Greek worship. Upon the autonomic coins of the town, belonging probably to the last decades before Christ (soon after Caesar), is found almost universally the image of Zeus.⁵⁶ In the time of Claudius, Ptolemais became a Roman colony. Upon the very numerous subsequent coins is found chiefly Tyche (Fortuna); likewise Artemis, Pluto and Persephone, Perseus with Medusa, the Egyptian Serapis and the Phrygian Cybele.⁵⁷ The Mishna gives an account of a meeting of the famous scribe Gamaliel II. with a heathen philosopher in the bath of Aphrodite.⁵⁸

Beside the towns on the coast, it was chiefly the districts in the *east of Palestine* which were the earliest and the most completely Hellenized. It is probable that Alexander the Great and the Diadochoi here founded a number of Greek towns, or Hellenized towns already existing. Hence arose in early times a series of centres of Greek culture in these parts. Their prosperity was interrupted for only a short time by the chaotic work of destruction of Alexander Jannaeus. For Pompey already made an independent development again possible to them by separating them from the Jewish realm and combining them probably under the name of *Decapolis* into a certain sort of unity.

Damascus is reckoned by Pliny and Ptolemy as the chief among these cities of Decapolis. It was an important arsenal even in the time of Alexander the Great. Its Hellenistic character at that period is testified to by coins of Alexander, which were minted there (see § 23. I. Nr. 12). From that time onward it became increasingly a Hellenistic city. At the partition of the great empire of the Seleucids into several portions towards the end of the second century before Christ, it even became for a while the capital of one of

⁵⁶ De Saulcy, pp. 154–156.

⁵⁷ Mionnet, v. 473–481; *Suppl.* viii. 324–331. Tyche (Fortuna) frequently. Artemis, n. 29, 39. Pluto and Persephone, n. 37. Perseus, *Suppl.* n. 19, 20. Serapis, n. 16, 24, 28. Cybele, n. 42. Still more in De Saulcy, pp. 157–169, pl. viii.

⁵⁸ *Aboda sara* iii. 4.

these smaller kingdoms. As was consequently to be expected, the autonomic and mostly dated coins of Damascus reaching to the commencement of the Roman Empire, present us with the purely Greek deities: Artemis, Athene, Nike, Tyche, Helios, Dionysos.⁵⁹ Upon imperial coins proper the emblems and images of stated divinities are, comparatively speaking, but seldom found. Silenus, the honoured companion of Dionysus and with him Dionysos himself here occur the most frequently; especially in the third century after Christ.⁶⁰ The Hellenistic legend, which connects him with the foundation of Damascus, also points to the worship of this god.⁶¹ Perhaps his worship both here and in other cities of Eastern Palestine is to be traced to Arabian influence. For the principal deity of the Arabians was conceived of by the Greeks as Dionysos.⁶² Upon the Greek inscriptions, which have been preserved in Damascus and its neighbourhood, Zeus is more frequently mentioned.⁶³

In many of the towns of Decapolis, especially in Kanatha, Gerasa, and Philadelphia, the existing magnificent ruins of temples of the Roman period still bear witness to the former splendour of the Hellenistic worship in these towns.⁶⁴ Of the special worships of the several towns, we have for the most part but deficient information. In Scythopolis, Dionysos must have been specially honoured.

⁵⁹ De Sauley, pp. 30–33. Artemis, n. 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 14, 21. Athene, n. 2, 8, 14, 15. Nike, n. 11, 12, 22, 23. Tyche, n. 17, 18. Helios, n. 3, 21. Dionysos, n. 24, 25. Most also in Mionnet, v. 283 sq.; *Suppl.* viii. 193 sqq.

⁶⁰ Mionnet, v. 285–297; *Suppl.* viii. 193–206. Silenus, n. 61, 62, 68, 69, 72, 77, 85; *Suppl.* n. 34, 35, 48. Dionysos, n. 80, 88. The most also in De Sauley, pp. 35–56.

⁶¹ Stephanus Byz. s.v. *Δαμασκός*.

⁶² Herodot. iii. 8. Arrian, vii. 20. Strabo, xvi. p. 741. Origenes, *contra Cels.* v. 37. Hesych. *Lex.* s.v. *Δουσιάνης*. Krehl, *Ueber die Religion der vorislamischen Araber*, 1863, pp. 29 sqq., 48 sqq.

⁶³ Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscriptions*, vol. iii. n. 1879, 2549, 2550. *Ζεύς Κεραύνιος* (at Deir Kanun on the Nahr Barada). *Corp. Inscr. Græc.* 4520 = Waddington, n. 2557^a.

⁶⁴ See the geographical literature mentioned in § 23. I.

For the town was also called Nysa,⁶⁵ and this is the mythological name of the place, in which Dionysos was brought up by the nymphs.⁶⁶ The name Scythopolis was also referred mythologically to Dionysos (see § 23. I. Nr. 19). On the coins of *Gadara* Zeus is most frequently met with, also Herakles, Astarte and other individual deities.⁶⁷ Artemis is depicted on the coins of Gerasa as the *Τύχη Γεράσων*.⁶⁸ In Philadelphia Herakles appears to have been the principal divinity, *Τύχη Φιλαδελφείων*, other individual gods also occurring.⁶⁹ The coins of the other cities of Decapolis are not numerous, and offer but insufficient material.

Apart from the coast towns and the cities of Decapolis, there are only two other cities in which especially Hellenism gained an early footing, viz. Samaria and Panias. Alexander the Great is said to have settled colonists in *Samaria*. In any case it was an important Hellenistic military post in the times of the Diadochoi (see § 33. I. Nr. 24). The town was indeed razed to the ground by John Hyrcanus, but the Hellenist rites must certainly have been re-established at its restoration by Gabinius, and have attained still greater ascendancy at the

⁶⁵ Plinius, *Hist. Nat.* v. 18. 74: *Scythopolim antea Nysam*. Steph. Byz. s.v. Σκυθόπολις, Παλαιστίνης πόλις, ἡ Νύσσης (1. Νύσσα) Κοίλης Συρίας. On coins chiefly Νυσ[αίων ?] Σκυθο[πολιτῶν].

⁶⁶ A whole number of towns claimed to be the true Nysa. See Steph. Byz. s.v. (Νύσαι πόλεις πολλαί), Pauly's *Encycl.* v. 794 sq. Pape-Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griech. Eigennamen*, s.v.

⁶⁷ Mionnet, v. 323–328; *Suppl.* viii. 227–230. De Saulcy, pp. 294–303, pl. xv.

⁶⁸ Mionnet, v. 329; *Suppl.* viii. 230 sq. De Saulcy, p. 384 sq., pl. xxii. n. 1–2.

⁶⁹ Mionnet, v. 330–333. *Suppl.* viii. 232–236. De Saulcy, pp. 386–392, pl. xxii. n. 3–9. The bust of the young Herakles is found with the superscription Ηρακλης upon a coin of Marcus Aurelius and L. Verus (see the representation of it in De Saulcy, pl. xxii. n. 7). Upon two others (one of Marcus Aurelius, the other of Commodus) is depicted a vehicle drawn by four horses, with the superscription Ηρακλείου (Mionnet, n. 77, 80; De Saulcy, pp. 390, 391). According to the ingenious supposition of Eckhel (*Doctr. Num.* iii. 351), we are to understand by the latter a small statue or *scellum* which was on festivals carried in procession. The *Τύχη Φιλαδελφείων* upon the coins of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, see De Saulcy, p. 389.

enlargement of the town by Herod the Great, who also here erected a magnificent temple to Augustus.⁷⁰ On the other worships some further information is furnished by coins attributable to times subsequent to Nero.⁷¹ In *Panias*, the subsequent *Caesarea Philippi*, the Greek Pan must have been worshipped since the commencement of Hellenic times in the grotto there; for the locality is in the days of Antiochus the Great already mentioned by the name of τὸ Πάνειον (see § 23. I. Nr. 29). The continuance of his worship in later times is also abundantly testified by coins and inscriptions.⁷² Herod the Great built here as well as in *Caesarea Stratonis* and *Samaria* a temple of Augustus.⁷³ Of other deities Zeus is most frequently found upon the coins, some appear singly; the image of Pan is, however, by far the most prevalent.⁷⁴

Subsequently to the second century after Christ, Hellenic worship may be proved to have existed in other towns of Palestine also, as *Sepphoris*, *Tiberias*, etc. It may however be assumed with tolerable certainty, that it found no favour in them before the *Vespasian war*. For till then the cities in question were chiefly inhabited by *Jews*, who would hardly have tolerated the public exercise of heathen worship in their midst.⁷⁵

The case was different with the half-heathen districts of *Trachonitis*, *Batanaea*, and *Auranitis*, east of the *Lake of Gennesareth*. Here too the Hellenistic worships probably

⁷⁰ *Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 2; comp. *Antt.* xv. 8. 5.

⁷¹ *Mionnet*, v. 513–516; *Suppl.* viii. 356–359. De Saulcy, pp. 275–281, pl. xiv. n. 4–7.

⁷² The coins in *Mionnet*, v. 311–315, n. 10, 13, 16, 20, 23; *Suppl.* viii. 217–220, n. 6, 7, 8, 10. Others in De Saulcy, pp. 313–324, pl. xviii.; comp. especially the representations of Pan with the flute in De Saulcy, pl. xviii. n. 8, 9, 10. The inscriptions in *Le Bas et Waddington*, *Inscr.* vol. iii. n. 1891, 1892, 1893 (= *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4538, 4537, *Addenda*, p. 1179).

⁷³ *Antt.* xv. 10. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 3.

⁷⁴ See *Mionnet* and De Saulcy's above-named work.

⁷⁵ That there were no heathen temples in *Tiberius* may be indirectly inferred also from *Joseph. Vita*, 12. For only the destruction of Herod's palace adorned with images of animals is mentioned, not that of heathen temples.

first penetrated to a wider extent subsequently to the second century after Christ. But the work of Hellenization began with the appearance of Herod and his sons, who gained for culture these hitherto half-barbarous places (see above, p. 4). The worship of Hellenic deities was afterwards admitted. The inscriptions, of which a special abundance has been preserved in these regions, testify to its prevalence from the second to the fourth centuries. The same observation must however here be made as with respect to the Philistine towns, viz. that the native Arabian deities were still maintained beside the Greek gods.

Among these *Dusares*, compared by the Greeks to Dionysos, takes the first place. His worship in Roman times is testified chiefly by the games dedicated to him, the *Ἀκτια Δουσάρια* in *Adraa* and *Bostra*.⁷⁶ Several other Arabian gods, the names of some of whom are all that is known to us, are also mentioned upon the inscriptions.⁷⁷ The Greek deities have, however, the preponderance during this period. Among them by far the most frequently occurring is Zeus,⁷⁸ and next to him Dionysos, Kronos, Herakles.⁷⁹ Of female deities the

⁷⁶ *Δουσάρης* in Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscr.* vol. iii. n. 2023, 2312. The Nom. propr. *Δουσάριος*, n. 1916. *אשרא* in de Vogüé, *Syrie Centrale, Inscriptions sémitiques*, pp. 113, 120. The *Ἀκτια Δουσάρια* in Mionnet, v. 577-585, n. 5, 6, 18, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37. The same also in De Saulcy, pp. 375, 365, 369 sq. Comp. Tertullian, *Apolog.* 24: *Unicuique etiam provinciae et civitati suus deus est, ut Syriae Astartes, ut Arabiae Dusares.* Hesych. *Lex. s.v.*: *Δουσάρην τὸν Διόνυσον Ναβαταῖοι.* Krehl, *Ueber die Religion der vorislamischen Araber* (1863), p. 48 sq. Waddington's illustrations to n. 2023. Mordtmann, *Dusares* in Epiphanius (*Ztschr. der DMG.* 1875, pp. 99-106).

⁷⁷ *Θεανδρίτης* or *Θεάνδριος* in Waddington, n. 2046, 2374^a (*C. I. Gr.* 4609, *Addend.* p. 1181), 2481. See concerning him Waddington's illustrations to n. 2046. *Οὐασαϊάθου*, Waddington, n. 2374, 2374^a. *אצי*, Qaçiu, in de Vogüé, *Syrie Centrale, Inscr. sémit.* pp. 96, 103. *אלת*, *Allath* (a female deity), de Vogüé, pp. 100, 107, 119.

⁷⁸ Waddington, n. 2116, 2140, 2211, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2292, 2339, 2340, 2390, 2412^d (Wetzstein, 185), 2413^b (Wetzst. 179), 2413^j (*C. I. Gr.* 4558), 2413^k (*C. I. Gr.* 4559). *Ζεύς Τέλειος*, n. 2484.

⁷⁹ Dionysos, Waddington, n. 2309. Kronos, n. 2375, 2544. Heracles, n. 2413^c (Wetzst. 177), 2428.

most frequent are Athene⁸⁰ and Tyche,⁸¹ then Aphrodite, Nike, Irene.⁸² Finally, the religious syncretism of the subsequent imperial period favoured other Oriental, as well as the ancient native deities. Among these the Syrian Sun-god, who is here adored, now under his Semitic name *Αὔμου*, now under his Greek name *Ἥλιος*, at another under both together, plays the chief part.⁸³ His worship so flourished in Constantine's time also, that a considerable temple could even then be erected for it in Auranitis.⁸⁴ Nay, the Christian preachers were only able to suppress it, by substituting for him the prophet *Ἡλίας*.⁸⁵ Besides the Syrian Sun-god, the worship of Marnas of Gaza and the Egyptian deities Ammon and Isis, may also be shown to have been practised.⁸⁶

Periodical *games* were often closely connected with the religious rites. In this department also the predominance of Hellenic customs may be proved by numerous examples. But even here authorities for the Greek period, properly so called, are extremely few. We know, that Alexander the Great celebrated splendid games at Tyre.⁸⁷ The *πενταετηρικὸς*

⁸⁰ Waddington, n. 2081, 2203^a (Wetzst. 16), 2216, 2308, 2410, 2453, 2461. Also with a local colouring (*Ἀθηνᾶ Γοζμαίη*, at Kanatha), n. 2345.

⁸¹ Waddington, n. 2127, 2176, 2413^f to 2413ⁱ (= *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4554 to 4557), 2506, 2512, 2514. In the Semitic *Τύχη* the name of a deity is rendered by *ἡ* (see Lagarde, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1866, p. 16. Mordtmann, *Zeitschr. d. DMG.* 1877, pp. 99–101, and comp. the locality near Jerusalem mentioned in the Mishna *סבם* *ḥabim* i. 5). It does not however follow that the worship of *Τύχη* can be traced back to the old Semitic *Gad*, the wide diffusion of which cannot be proved (comp. Baudissin in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* 2nd ed. iv. 722 sq.). Rather is the Syrian Astarte, with which Tyche is certainly generally connected, to be thought of (so also Mordtmann).

⁸² Aphrodite, Waddington, n. 2098. Nike, n. 2099, 2410, 2413j (*C. I. Gr.* 4558), 2479. Irene, n. 2526.

⁸³ *Αὔμου*, Waddington, n. 2441, 2455, 2456. *Ἥλιος*, n. 2398, 2407. *Ἥλιος θεὸς Αὔμος*, n. 2392, 2393, 2395.

⁸⁴ Waddington, n. 2393.

⁸⁵ See Waddington on n. 2497.

⁸⁶ Marnas, Waddington, n. 2412^g (Wetzst. 183). Ammon, n. 2313, 2382. Isis, n. 2527. Also upon a coin of Kanata in Mionnet, *Suppl.* viii. 225, n. 5.

⁸⁷ Arrian, ii. 24. 6; iii. 6. 1. Comp. Plutarch, *Alex.* c. 29. Droysen, *Gesch. d. Hellenismus* (2nd ed.), i. 1. 297, 325.

ἀγών held there is incidentally mentioned in the prefatory narrative of the Maccabean rising (2 Macc. iv. 18–20). On the same occasion we learn also that Antiochus Epiphanes desired to introduce the *Διονύσια* into Jerusalem (2 Macc. vi. 7). But it is just in the Hellenic towns of Palestine that the celebration of such solemnities during the pre-Roman period cannot be proved in detail, though from the general character of the age it must evidently be assumed.⁸⁸ Not till we come to the Roman period are authorities again abundant. The great importance of public games in imperial times is well known; not a provincial town of any consequence was without them.⁸⁹ This was especially the case with those in connection with the cult of the Emperor, the games *in honour of the emperor*, which were everywhere in vogue, even in the time of Augustus.⁹⁰ In Palestine also they were introduced by Herod into Caesarea and Jerusalem. Other games of various kinds also existed beside them. Their prevalence in the chief towns of Palestine in the second century after Christ is proved by an inscription at Aphrodisias in Caria, upon which the council and people of the Aphrodisians record the victories gained by one Aelius Aurelius Menander in several contests. Among the games here enumerated are some also which took place in Palestinian towns.⁹¹ In a similar inscription at Laodicea in Syria, of the

⁸⁸ Comp. Stark, *Gaza*, p. 594 sq.

⁸⁹ Compare on the games in the Roman period, especially Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengesch. Roms*, vol. ii. (3rd ed. 1874) pp. 261–622. On their organization and kinds, also Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. iii. (2nd ed. 1878) pp. 462–544 (also edited by Friedländer).

⁹⁰ Sueton. *Aug.* 59: provinciarum pleraeque super templa et aras *ludos quoque quinquennales* paene oppidatim constituerunt.

⁹¹ Le Bas et Waddington, vol. iii. n. 1620^b. The inscription, as is proved by another pertaining to it (n. 1620^a), is of the time of Marcus Aurelius. The part which interests us is as follows:—

Δαμασχὸν β' ἀνδρῶν πανκράτιν,
 Βηρυτὸν ἀνδρῶν πανκράτιν,
 Τύρον ἀνδρῶν πανκράτιν,
 Καισάρειαν τὴν Στράτωνος ἀνδρῶν πανκράτιν,
 Νέαν πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρίας ἀνδρῶν πανκράτιν

beginning of the third century after Christ, the victor himself transmits to posterity the victories he obtained. Here too many towns of Palestine are mentioned as the theatres of these victories.⁹² Lastly, in an anonymous *Descriptio totius orbis* of the middle of the 4th century after Christ, are enumerated the kinds of games and contests, for which the most important towns of Syria were then distinguished.⁹³ From these and other sources the following materials have been compiled.⁹⁴

In Gaza a *πανήγυρις Ἀδριανή* was celebrated from the time of Hadrian.⁹⁵ A *παγκράτιον* is mentioned as held there in the inscription of Aphrodisias.⁹⁶ The *pammacarii* (= *παμμάχοι* or *παγκρατιασταί*) of Gaza were in the fourth

Σκυθόπολιν ἀνδρῶν πανκράτιν,
Γάζαν ἀνδρῶν πανκράτιν,
Καيسάρειαν Πανιάδα β' ἀνδρῶν πανκράτιν, . . .
Φιλαδέλφειαν τῆς Ἀραβίας ἀνδρῶν πανκράτιν.

⁹² *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4472=Le Bas et Waddington, vol. iii. n. 1839. The date of the inscription is A.D. 221. It mentions among others games at Caesarea, Ascalon and Scythopolis.

⁹³ This originally Greek *Descriptio totius orbis* is preserved in two Latin paraphrases, both of which are given in Müller's *Geographi Graeci minores*, ii. 513–528. One also in Riese's *Geographi Latini minores* (1878), pp. 104–126. According to the freer but more intelligible version c. 32 runs as follows: *Iam nunc dicendum est quid etiam in se singulae civitates, de quibus loquimur, habeant delectabile. Habes ergo Antiochiam in ludis circensibus eminentem; similiter et Laodiciam et Tyrum et Berytum et Caesaream. Et Laodicia mittit aliis civitatibus agitadores optimos, Tyrius et Berytus mimarios, Caesarea pantomimos, Heliopolis choraulas, Gaza pammacarios, Ascalon athletas luctadores, Castabala pyctas.*

⁹⁴ In enumerating the towns I follow the same order as above when treating of the worship, and in § 23. I. The further information may also be given, that the *kinds of games* were in general as follows: (1) in the circus (*ἵπποδρομος*) the chariot race; (2) in the *amphitheatre* the contests of gladiators and fights of wild beasts; (3) in the theatre plays, properly so called, to which were also added pantomimes; (4) in the stadium gymnastic games—boxing, wrestling, and running; the latter were also sometimes held in the circus (Marquardt, iii. 504 sq.). At the great annual feasts several of these games were generally combined.

⁹⁵ *Chron. pasch.*, ed. Dindorf, i. 474.

⁹⁶ The *παγκράτιον* is the “joint contest,” which comprises both wrestling (*πάλη*) and boxing (*πυγμή*). Hence it belongs to the order of gymnastic games.

century the most famous in Syria.⁹⁷ Jerome in his *Life of Hilarion* mentions the Circensian games there.⁹⁸ Α *ταλαντιαῖος ἀγών* is testified for *Ascalon* in the inscription of Laodicea. Its wrestlers (*athletae luctatores*, see note 93) were particularly famous. In Caesarea a stone theatre and a large amphitheatre, the latter with a view of the sea, were built by Herod the Great;⁹⁹ a *στάδιον* is mentioned of the time of Pilate;¹⁰⁰ the town must also have had a circus from its commencement, since a *ἵππων δρόμος* was held (see below) so early as at the dedication by Herod. Even now traces and remains of a theatre are discernible.¹⁰¹ All the four species of games having thus been from the first provided for, it follows that all four were in fact celebrated at the dedication by Herod the Great.¹⁰² From that time onwards they were repeated every four years in honour of the emperor.¹⁰³ These were however of course not the only games held at Caesarea. All the four kinds may also be pointed out singly in later times. 1. The *ludi circenses* of Caesarea were in the fourth century after Christ as famous as those of Antioch, Laodicea, Tyre and Berytus (see note 93). 2. Titus instituted after the termina-

⁹⁷ See above, note 93. In the text of the second Latin translation of the *Descr. totius orbis*, it is said more fully concerning Gaza: aliquando autem et Gaza habet bonos auditores, dicitur autem habere eam et pammacharios. The Latin *auditores* is undoubtedly an erroneous translation, perhaps for *ἀκροαματικοί* (see Stark, *Gaza*, p. 595).

⁹⁸ Hieronymus, *Vita Hilarionis*, c. 20 (Opp. ed. Vallarsi, ii. 22): Sed et Italicus ejusdem oppidi municeps Christianus adversus Gazensem Duumvirum, Marnae idolo deditum, *circenses equos* nutriebat.

⁹⁹ *Antt.* xv. 9. 6 *fin.*; *Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 8.

¹⁰⁰ *Antt.* xviii. 3. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 3.

¹⁰¹ *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, ii. 13 sqq. (with plan of the town, p. 15).

¹⁰² *Antt.* xvi. 5. 1: κατηγγέλει μὲν γὰρ ἀγῶνα μουσικῆς καὶ γυμνικῆς ἀθλημάτων, παρεσκευάκει δὲ πολὺ πλῆθος μονομάχων καὶ θηρίων, ἵππων τε δρόμου, etc.

¹⁰³ The games were celebrated κατὰ πενταετηρίδα (*Antt.* xvi. 5. 1) and hence called πενταετηρικοὶ ἀγῶνες (*Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 8). According however to our mode of expression these games were held every four years. The same formula are constantly used of all fourth yearly games, the Olympic, the Actian, etc. See the *Lexica* and the material in the index to the *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* p. 158, s.v.

tion of the Jewish war gladiatorial contests and fights of wild beasts, in which hundreds of Jewish prisoners were sacrificed.¹⁰⁴ The Emperor Maximinus exhibited at the celebration of his birthday animals brought from India and Ethiopia.¹⁰⁵ 3. Games in the theatre are mentioned in the time of King Agrippa I.¹⁰⁶ The *pantomimi* of Caesarea were in the fourth century the most famous in Syria (see note 93). We must understand indeed of pantomimic games also, what Eusebius says of the games of Maximinus.¹⁰⁷ 4. A *παγκράτιον* is mentioned in the inscription of Aphrodisias, a boxing-match in that of Laodicea.¹⁰⁸ In Ptolemais a gymnasium was built by Herod the Great.^{108a}

In *Damascus* also a gymnasium and theatre were built by Herod the Great (see Josephus as before). The existence of a *παγκράτιον* there is testified to by the inscription of Aphrodisias, and *σεβάσματα* (games in honour of the emperor) are mentioned upon the coins since Macrinus.¹⁰⁹ Ruins of two theatres are still standing at Gadara.¹¹⁰ A *ναυμαχία* there occurs on the coins of Marcus Aurelius.¹¹¹ *Kanatha* has besides ruins of its temple those of a small theatre, hewn out in the rock and designated on an inscription as *θεατροειδὲς ᾠδείον*.¹¹² In *Scythopolis* traces of a hippodrome are found, and ruins of a theatre are still standing.¹¹³ A *παγκράτιον* is

¹⁰⁴ *Bell. Jud.* vii. 31.

¹⁰⁵ Euseb. *De Martyr. Palaest.* vi. 1-2.

¹⁰⁶ *Antt.* xix. 7. 4; 8. 2. On the games mentioned in the last passage, as held in honour of the Emperor Claudius, see above, § 18, *s. fin.*

¹⁰⁷ *De Martyr. Palaest.* vi. 2: ἀνδρῶν ἐντέχνους τοὶς σωμαστικαῖς παραδόξους ψυχαγωγίας τοῖς ὁρᾶσιν ἐνδείκνυμένων. See also the note of Valesius.

¹⁰⁸ This *πυγμή* took place on the occasion of the Σευήρειος Οἰκουμενικός Πυθικός (*scil. ἀγών*), i.e. of the Pythic games dedicated to the Emperor Septimius Severus.

^{108a} Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 11.

¹⁰⁹ Mionnet, v. 291 sqq.; *Suppl.* viii. 198 sqq. De Saulcy, p. 42 sqq.

¹¹⁰ See the geographical literature cited in § 23. I. note 179.

¹¹¹ See especially Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* iii. 348 sqq., also Mionnet, v. 326, n. 38. De Saulcy, p. 299.

¹¹² The inscription in Le Bas et Waddington, vol. iii. n. 2341. On the building itself, see the geographical literature cited § 23. I. note 214.

¹¹³ See especially, *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, vol. ii. p. 106 (plan of the hippodrome) and p. 107 (plan

mentioned in the inscription of Aphrodisias, and a *ταλαντιαῖος ἀγών* in that of Laodicea. Among the magnificent ruins of *Gerasa* are found those of two theatres and traces of a *Naumachia* (an amphitheatre erected for battles of ships).¹¹⁴ *Philadelphia* too possesses the ruins of a theatre and of an Odeum (a small roofed theatre),¹¹⁵ and a *παγκράτιον* is mentioned in the inscription of Aphrodisias. In *Caesarea Panias* "various spectacles" (*παντοίας θεωρίας*), especially gladiatorial contests and wild beast fights, in which Jewish prisoners were used, were given by Titus after the termination of the Jewish war.¹¹⁶ A *παγκράτιον* held there is mentioned in the inscription of Aphrodisias. On games in the Jewish towns (Jerusalem, Jericho, Tarichea, Tiberias), see the next section.

Besides the religious rites and games, there is finally a third point which shows how deeply Hellenism had penetrated in many of these towns, viz. that they produced men, who gained a name in Greek literature. Among the coast towns *Ascalon* is especially prominent in this respect. In *Stephanus* of Byzantium (*s.v.* *Ἀσκάλων*) are enumerated four Stoic philosophers: Antiochus, Sosus, Antibius, Eubius, who were natives of Ascalon. Of these only Antiochus is elsewhere known. He was a contemporary of Lucullus and a teacher of Cicero, and therefore belongs to the first century before Christ. His system is moreover not exactly stoic but eclectic.¹¹⁷ As grammarians of Ascalon, Ptolemaeus and Dorotheas, as historians Apollonius and Artemidorus are named by Steph. Byz. The two latter are unknown. Dorotheas is elsewhere quoted, but his date cannot be decided.¹¹⁸ Next to the philosopher

of the theatre). The theatre is according to Conder (ii. 106) the best preserved specimen of Roman work in Western Palestine.

¹¹⁴ See the geographical literature cited § 23, note 1. 253.

¹¹⁵ See the literature cited § 23, note 1. 270.

¹¹⁶ *Bell. Jud.* vii. 2. 1.

¹¹⁷ See Pauly's *Encykl.* i. 1 (2nd ed.), p. 1141 sq., and the literature there cited, especially Zeller. Also Hoyer, *De Antiocho Ascalonita*, Bonn 1883.

¹¹⁸ See Fabricius, *Biblioth. graeca*, ed. Harles, i. 511, vi. 365, x. 719 Pauly's *Encykl.* ii. 1251. Nicolai, *Griech. Literaturgesch.* ii. 381.

Antiochus, the grammarian Ptolemaeus is best known.¹¹⁹ If he was, as stated by Stephen, Ἀριστάρχου γνώριμος, he would belong to the second century before Christ. He is probably however of a considerably later date (about the beginning of the Christian era).¹²⁰ Among the towns of Decapolis Gadara and Gerasa are especially to be mentioned as the birthplaces of distinguished men. Of Gadara was the Epicurean Philodemus, the contemporary of Cicero, numerous fragments of whose writings have become known through the rolls discovered in Herculaneum; also the epigrammatic poet Meleager and the cynic Menippus, both probably belonging to the first century before Christ. The Greek anthology contains more than a hundred epigrams of Meleager, nay he was himself the founder of this collection. Lastly the rhetorician Theodorus, the tutor of the Emperor Tiberius, was also a Gadarene. All the four are already mentioned in combination by Strabo.¹²¹ Of Gerasa were, according to Steph. Byz. (s.v. Γέρασα): Ariston (ῥήτωρ ἀστείος), Kerykos (σοφιστής) and Plato (νομικὸς ῥήτωρ), all three not otherwise known.

2. Hellenism in the Jewish Region.^{121a}

In the Jewish region proper Hellenism was in its religious aspect triumphantly repulsed by the rising of the Maccabees; it was not till after the overthrow of Jewish nationality in the wars of Vespasian and Hadrian, that an entrance for heathen

¹¹⁹ See Fabricius, *Biblioth. graeca*, i. 521, vi. 156 sqq. Pauly's *Encykl.* vi. 1, 142. Nicolai, *Griech. Literaturgesch.* ii. 347. Baeye, *De Ptolemaeo Ascalonita*, 1882; also in *Dissertationes philol. Halenses*, v. 2, 1883.

¹²⁰ Comp. on the date of Ptolemy, Baeye, pp. 2-6. In Stark, *Gaza*, he is, certainly through inadvertence, transposed to the middle of the third century.

¹²¹ Strabo, xvi. p. 759. For further particulars on all four, see the works of Fabricius (*Biblioth. graec.*), Pauly (*Encykl.*), Nicolai (*Griech. Literaturgesch.*); on Philodemus and Menippus in the works of Zeller and Ueberweg on the history of Greek philosophy; on Menippus, Wildenow, *De Menippo Cynico*, Halis Sax. 1881.

^{121a} Comp. in general Hamburger, *Realencyclop. für Bibel und Talmud*, 2nd Div., article "Griechenthum."

rites was forcibly obtained by the Romans. In saying this however we do not assert, that the Jewish people of those early times remained *altogether* unaffected by Hellenism. For the latter was a civilising power, which extended itself to every department of life. It fashioned in a peculiar manner the organization of the state, legislation, the administration of justice, public arrangements, art and science, trade and industry, and the customs of daily life down to fashion and ornaments, and thus impressed upon every department of life, wherever its influence reached, the stamp of the Greek mind. It is true that *Hellenistic* is not identical with *Hellenic* culture. The importance of the former on the contrary lay in the fact, that by its reception of the available elements of all foreign cultures within its reach, it became a world-culture. But this very world-culture became in its turn a peculiar whole, in which the preponderant Greek element was the ruling keynote. Into the stream of this Hellenistic culture the Jewish people was also drawn; slowly indeed and with reluctance, but yet irresistibly, for though religious zeal was able to banish heathen worship and all connected therewith from Israel, it could not for any length of time restrain the tide of Hellenistic culture in other departments of life. Its several stages cannot indeed be any longer traced. But when we reflect that the small Jewish country was enclosed on almost every side by Hellenistic regions, with which it was compelled, even for the sake of trade, to hold continual intercourse, and when we remember, that even the rising of the Maccabees was in the main directed not against Hellenism in general, but only against the heathen religion, that the later Asmonaeans bore in every respect a Hellenistic stamp—employed foreign mercenaries, minted foreign coins, took Greek names, etc., and that some of them, *e.g.* Aristobulus I., were direct favourers of Hellenism,—when all this is considered, it may safely be assumed, that Hellenism had, notwithstanding the rising of the Maccabees, gained access in no inconsiderable measure into Palestine even before the commencement of the Roman period. Its further

diffusion was not to any considerable amount promoted by the rule of the Romans and Herodians, who added to it that *Latin* element, which makes itself so very apparent especially after the first century of the Christian era. For this later age (the first half of the second century after Christ), the Mishna affords us copious material, plainly showing the influence of Hellenism upon every sphere of life. A multitude of Greek and also of Latin words in the Hebrew of the Mishna shows, how it was just Hellenistic culture which had gained an ascendancy in Palestine also. A series of examples may serve to substantiate this in detail also.¹²²

It is chiefly of course in the department of *civil government* and *military matters* that, together with foreign arrangements, we find foreign terms also current. A provincial governor is called הנמן (ἡγεμών), a province הגמוניא (ἡγεμονία), the municipal authorities of a town ארכי (ἀρχή).¹²³ For soldiers in general the Latin ליונות (legiones) is used; an army is called אסטרטא (στρατία), war פולמוס (πόλεμος), pay אפסניא (ὀψώνιον), a helmet קסדא (cassida), a shield תרים (θυρεός).¹²⁴ In matters of jurisprudence, Jewish traditions were in general strictly adhered to. The law, given to His people by God through

¹²² The compilation following is for the most part the result of my own collection. Anton Theodor Hartmann's catalogue of the Greek and Latin words in the Mishna (*Thesauri linguae hebraicae e Mishna augendi particula* i. (Rostochii 1825), pp. 40-47, comp. Pt. iii. (1826, p. 95)), a very careful work, though not complete as to authorities, has furnished me with several needed additions. Comp. also on the foreign words in the Mishna and Talmud, Sachs, *Beitrage zur Sprach- und Alterthumsforschung aus jüdischen Quellen*, Nos. I. and II. 1852-1854. Cassel in Ersch and Gruber's *Encycl.*, Div. ii. vol. 27, p. 28 sq. Adolf Brull, *Fremdsprachliche Redensarten und ausdrücklich als fremdsprachlich bezeichnete Wörter in den Talmuden und Midraschim*, Leipzig 1869. Perles, *Etymologische Studien zur Kunde der rabbinische Sprache und Altherthümer*, Breslau 1871. N. Brull, *Fremdsprachliche Wörter in den Talmuden und Midraschim* (*Jahrb. für jüdische Gesch. und Literatur*, i. 1874, pp. 123-220).

¹²³ הנמן, *Edujoth* vii. 7; הגמוניא, *Gittin* i. 1; ארכי, *Kiddushin* iv. 5.

¹²⁴ ליונות, *Kelim* xxix. 6; Ohaloth xviii. 10; אסטרטא, *Kiddushin* iv. 5; פולמוס, *Sota* ix. 14; Para viii. 9; אפסניא (not אספניא), see Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterbuch*, s.v., *Sanhedrin* ii. 4; קסדא, *Shabbath* vi. 2; *Kelim* xi. 8; תרים, *Shabbath* vi. 4; *Sota* viii. 1; *Aboth* iv. 11.

Moses, extended not only to sacred transactions, but also to matters of civil law and the organization of the administration of justice. Here too then the Old Testament was in essential points the standard. We nevertheless meet with Greek terms and arrangements in some particulars in these departments also. The court of justice is indeed generally called בית דין, but sometimes also סנהדרין (*συνέδριον*), the assessors פרהדרין (*πάρεδροι*), the accuser קטיגור (*κατήγορος*), the advocate פרקליט (*παράκλητος*), a deposit אפותיקי (*ὑποθήκη*), a testament דיתיקי (*διαθήκη*), a guardian or steward אפיטרופוס (*ἐπίτροπος*).¹²⁵ Nay even for a specifically Jewish legal institution, introduced in the time of Hillel, viz. the declaration before a court of justice, that the right to call in a given loan at any time was reserved notwithstanding the Sabbatic year, the Greek expression פרחובל (*προσβολή*) was used.¹²⁶

Of other public institutions, *games* again come first into notice. Pharisaic Judaism has always repudiated the heathen kind of games. Philo indeed says in his work, *Quod omnis probus liber*, that he was once present at an ἀγὼν παγκρατιαστῶν, and another time at the performance of a tragedy of Euripides.¹²⁷ But what the cultured Alexandrian allowed himself was no standard for the strict legal Palestinians. Even in the period of the Maccabees the building of a gymnasium in Jerusalem and the visiting of the same on the part of the Jews is mentioned as a chief abomination of the prevailing Hellenism (1 Macc. i. 14, 15; 2 Macc. iv. 9–17). And this continued to be the standpoint of legal Judaism.¹²⁸

¹²⁵ סנהדרין, *Sota* ix. 11; *Kiddushin* iv. 5; *Sanhedrin* i. 5–6; *Shebuoth* ii. 2, *Middoth* v. 4; specially abundant in the later Targums, see Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.*, and Levy, *Chald. Wörterb. s.v.*—פרהדרין, *Joma* l. 1; קטיגור and פרקליט, *Aboth* iv. 11; אפותיקי, *Gittin* iv. 4; דיתיקי, *Moed katan* iii. 3; *Baba mezia* i. 7; *Baba bathra* viii. 6; אפיטרופוס, *Shebiith* x. 6; *Bikkurim* i. 5; *Pesachim* viii. 1; *Gittin* v. 4; *Baba kamma* iv. 4, 7; *Baba bathra* iii. 3; *Shebuoth* vii. 8; אפיטרופא (stewardess), *Kethuboth* ix. 4, 6.

¹²⁶ פרחובל, *Pea* iii. 6; *Shebiith* x. 3–7; *Moed katan* iii. 3; *Kethuboth* ix. 9; *Gittin* iv. 3; *Ukzin* iii. 10.

¹²⁷ *Opp. ed. Mangey*, ii. 449 and 467.

¹²⁸ *Aboda sara* i. 7: "Neither bears, lions, nor anything from which harm

Even Josephus designates the theatre and amphitheatre as "foreign to Jewish customs."¹²⁹ Judaism however was unable, in spite of this theoretic repudiation, to prevent the pageantry of heathen games from developing in the midst of the Holy Land during and after the Herodian period; and we cannot assume that the mass of the Jewish population denied themselves from visiting them. A theatre and amphitheatre were built in Jerusalem by Herod, who instituted there as well as at Caesarea games every four years in honour of the emperor.¹³⁰ The games imply the existence also of a stadium and hippodrome, the latter indeed is once expressly mentioned.¹³¹ In *Jericho* where Herod seems to have frequently resided were a theatre, amphitheatre and hippodrome.¹³² In *Tiberias* a stadium is incidentally mentioned.¹³³ Even so unimportant a town as *Tarichea* had a hippodrome.¹³⁴

The public *baths* and public *inns* were further arrangements showing the influence of Hellenism. The bath indeed was designated by a purely Hebrew expression מִחְוֵה. But the name for the director of the bath, בַּלָּנֵא (βαλανεύς), points to its Greek origin.¹³⁵ In the case of the public inns their Greek

to others might arise, might be sold to the heathen. They may not be helped in building a Basilica, a place of execution (Gradum), a Stadium or Bema. Comp. in general, Winer, *Realwörterb.* s.v. "Spiele" and the literature there cited. Löw, *Die Lebensalter in der jüdischen Literatur* (1875), pp. 291–300. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästin. Theologie* (1880), p. 68: Opinion was everywhere very strict "on the theatre and circus of the heathen." Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. article "Theater."

¹²⁹ *Antt.* xv. 8. 1: θέατρον . . ἀμφιθέατρον, περίοπτα μὲν ἄμφω τῇ πολυτελείᾳ, τοῦ δὲ κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἔθους ἀλλότρια· χρήσις τε γὰρ αὐτῶν καὶ θεαμάτων τοιούτων ἐπιδείξις οὐ παραδίδοται. The Jews saw in these games a φανερά κατάλοις τῶν τιμαμένων παρ' αὐτοῖς ἔθων.

¹³⁰ *Antt.* xv. 8. 1. The games at Jerusalem, like those at Caesarea, comprised all the four kinds: gymnastic and musical games, chariot racing and contests of wild beasts. See the further description in Josephus as above.

¹³¹ *Antt.* xviii. 10. 2; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 3. 1.

¹³² Theatre, *Antt.* xvii. 6. 3. Amphitheatre, *Antt.* xvii. 3. 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 33. 8. Hippodrome, xvii. 6. 5; *Bell. Jud.* i. 33. 6.

¹³³ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 6, iii. 10. 10; *Vita*, xvii. 64.

¹³⁴ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 3; *Vita*, xxvii. 28.

¹³⁵ בַּלָּנֵא, *Kelim* xvii. 1; *Sabim* iv. 2. Compare on the baths as a heathen

name, פונדק (πανδοκεῖον or πανδοχεῖον), already showed them to be a product of the Hellenistic period.¹³⁶

Architecture in general and especially in public buildings must be regarded as emphatically a Hellenizing element.¹³⁷ In the Hellenistic towns in the neighbourhood of Palestine this is of course self-evident. They all had their ναούς, θέατρα, γυμνάσια, ἐξέδρας, στοάς, ἀγοράς, ὑδάτων εἰσαγωγάς, βαλανεῖα, κρήνας and περίστυλα in Greek fashion.¹³⁸ But also in Palestine proper, the prevalence of the Greek style—especially since the time of Herod—may be safely assumed. When Herod built himself a splendid palace, there can be no doubt that he adopted for it the Graeco-Roman style.¹³⁹ The same remark applies also to the other contemporary palaces and monuments of Jerusalem. In any case not only were Stadia¹⁴⁰ known in Palestine,—as must be assumed from what has been remarked about the games,—but also Basilica.¹⁴¹

institution but one permissible to Jews, especially *Aboda sara* i. 7, iii. 4. On their diffusion and arrangements, Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, vol. i. (1879) p. 262 sqq. Hermann and Blümner, *Lehrb. der griechischen Privatalterthümer* (1882), p. 210 sqq.

¹³⁶ פונדק, *Jebamoth* xvi. 7; *Gittin* viii. 9; *Kiddushin* iv. 12; *Edujoth* iv. 7; *Aboda sara* ii. 1. פונדקית (the hostess), *Demai* iii. 5; *Jebamoth* xvi. 7. Foreign travellers are called אכסניא or אכסנאין (ξένοι), *Demai* iii. 1; *Chullin* viii. 2. פונדקי not unfrequently in the Targums, see Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.*, and Levy, *Chald. Wörterb. s.v.* Α δημόσιον or κοινὸν πανδοχεῖον occurs in two inscriptions in the Hauran, Le Bas et Waddington, vol. iii. n. 2462, 2463. The word also occurs, as is well known, in the N. T. (Luke x. 34). See Wetstein, *Nov. Test.* on Luke x. 34; Hermann and Blümner, *Lehrb. der griechischen Privatalterthümer*, p. 499 sqq., and the Lexicons.

¹³⁷ Comp. Winer, *RWB.*, article "Baukunst." Rüetschi in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 2nd ed. ii. 132 sqq. De Saulcy, *Histoire de l'art judaïque*, Paris 1858. Conder, *Notes on Architecture in Palestine* (*Quarterly Statement*, 1878, pp. 29–40). Almost all the ruins that remain belong to the non-Jewish towns of Palestine.

¹³⁸ See especially the summary of the buildings of Herod, *Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 11. On Gaza, comp. Stark, 598 sqq. On Berytus, the buildings of the two Agrippas, *Antt.* xix. 7. 5, xx. 9. 4. On the public buildings, which were everywhere customary in Greek towns, see Hermann and Blümner, *Lehrb. der griechischen Privatalterthümer* (1882), p. 132 sqq.

¹³⁹ See the description *Bell. Jud.* v. 4. 4.

¹⁴⁰ פונדק (στάδιον), *Baba kamma* iv. 4; *Aboda sara* i. 7

¹⁴¹ פונדק (βασιλική), *Aboda sara* i. 7; *Tohoroth* vi. 8.

porticoes,¹⁴² porches,¹⁴³ Tribunes,¹⁴⁴ banqueting-halls¹⁴⁵ and other buildings after the Graeco-Roman manner. Even in the temple at Jerusalem the Grecian style of architecture was copiously adopted. It is true that in the temple proper (the ναός) Herod could not venture to forsake the old traditional forms. But in the building of the inner fore-court we see the influence of Greek models. Its gates had fore-courts (ἐξέδραι) within, between which colonnades (στοαί) ran along the inside of the walls.¹⁴⁶ The gate at the eastern side of the outer court had folding doors of Corinthian brass, which were more costly than those covered with gold and silver.¹⁴⁷ Quite in the Grecian style were the colonnades (στοαί), which surrounded the outer court on all four sides. Most of them were double (διπλαῖ),¹⁴⁸ but the most magnificent were those found on the south side. They were in the form of a basilikon (βασίλειος στοά); four rows of large Corinthian columns, together 162 in number, formed a three-aisled hall, the middle aisle of which was broader by a half than the two side aisles and as high again.¹⁴⁹ All this does not indeed prove, that the Grecian was the prevailing style for ordinary private houses, nor may this be assumed. Occasionally we

¹⁴² אֵצֶטבא (στοά), *Shekalim* viii. 4; *Sukka* iv. 4; *Ohaloth* xviii. 9; *Tohoroth* vi. 10.

¹⁴³ אַכסדרה (ἐξέδρα), *Maaseroth* iii. 6; *Erubin* viii. 4; *Sota* viii. 3; *Tamid* i. 3; *Middoth* i. 5; *Ohaloth* vi. 2. The ἐξέδρα is an open fore-court in front of the house door. See especially *Ohaloth* vi. 2.

¹⁴⁴ בימה (βῆμα), *Sota* vii. 8; *Aboda sara* i. 7.

¹⁴⁵ טריקלין (τρίκλινος), *Erubin* vi. 6; *Baba bathra* vi. 4; *Aboth* iv. 16; *Middoth* i. 6.

¹⁴⁶ The ἐξέδραι are mentioned by this name in the Mishna also (*Tamid* i. 3; *Middoth* i. 5). Comp. *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 3; also v. 1. 5 *fin.*, vi. 2. 7, 4. 1; *Antt.* xx. 8. 11. On the στοαί of the inner court, see *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 2 *fin.*, vi. 5. 2 (where they are decidedly distinguished from those of the outer).

¹⁴⁷ *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 3, *init.* Comp. also on this gate, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 3, vi. 5. 3. It was probably identical with the θύρα ὡραία mentioned *Acts* iii. 2.

¹⁴⁸ *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 2, *init.*; comp. *Bell. Jud.* v. 3, and also Philo, *De monarchia*, lib. ii. § 2. The στοαί are also mentioned in the Mishna under this Greek designation (*Shekalim* viii. 4; *Sukka* iv. 4).

¹⁴⁹ *Antt.* xv. 11. 5.

see also that Phœnician and Egyptian architecture was also found in Palestine.¹⁵⁰

Plastic art could, by reason of the Jewish repudiation of all images of men and beasts, find no entrance into Palestine; and it was only in isolated cases, as *e.g.* when Herod the Great had a golden eagle brought into the temple, or Herod Antipas placed images of animals on his palace at Tiberias, that the Herodians allowed themselves to defy Jewish views.¹⁵¹ Grecian *music* was undoubtedly represented at the feasts at Jerusalem and elsewhere.¹⁵² The musical instruments of the Greeks, *κίθαρς*, *ψαλτήριον* and *συμφωνία*, are, as is well known, mentioned in the Book of Daniel and also in the Mishna.¹⁵³ Of games of amusement dice, *קוביא* (*κυβεία*), were, as the name shows, introduced into Palestine by the Greeks. They also were repudiated by the stricter Jews.¹⁵⁴ In the matter of *writing* the influence

¹⁵⁰ Tyrian courts to houses are mentioned *Maaseroth* iii. 5; Tyrian and Egyptian windows, *Baba bathra* iii. 6. The Tyrian houses were particularly large and elegant, see Strabo, xvi. p. 757, *init.*; Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 9.

¹⁵¹ The eagle in the temple, *Antt.* xvii. 6. 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 33. 2. The representations of animals on the palace at Tiberias, Joseph. *Vita*, 12. Representations of animals are also found upon the remarkable ruins of Arâk el-Emir, north-west of Heshbon, which are evidently identical with the castle of Tyrus mentioned by Josephus in the neighbourhood of Heshbon, the building of which he ascribes to one Hyrcanus of the time of Seleucus IV. (*Antt.* xii. 4. 11). It is however questionable, whether the castle with its rude figures of animals is not older than Josephus supposes, viz. of pre-Hellenistic origin; see De Vogüé, *Le Temple de Jerusalem* (1864), pp. 37–42, pl. xxxiv., xxxv. Tuch, *Report of the Saxon Gesellsch. der Wissensch. philol.-hist. Cl.* (1865), pp. 18–36. De Saulcy, *Voyage en Terre Sainte* (1865), i. 211 sqq. The same in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscr. et Belles Lettres*, vol. xxvi. 1 (1867), pp. 83–117 with pl. viii. Duc de Luynes, *Voyage d'exploration à la mer morte*, etc., pl. 30–33. Bâdeker, *Palästina* (1875), pp. 320–322.

¹⁵² Herod offered prizes τοῖς ἐν τῇ μουσικῇ διαγωνιμένοις καὶ θυμελικαῖς καλουμένοις . . . καὶ δισποῦδαστο πάντας τοὺς ἐπισημοτάτους ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμιλλαν (*Antt.* xv. 8. 1).

¹⁵³ Dan. iii. 3, 5, 10, 15. On the several instruments, see especially the article in Gesenius' *Thesaurus*. כִּסְפוּנִי, also *Kelim* xi. 6, xvi. 8. On music in general among the Jews, Winer, *RWB.* ii. 120–125. Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 2nd ed. x. 387–398. Löw, *Die Lebensalter in der jüdischen Literatur*, p. 300 sqq.

¹⁵⁴ קוביא, *Shabbath* xxiii. 2; *Rosh hashana* i. 8; *Sanhedrin* iii. 3; *Shebuoth*

of the Greek and Roman periods is shown in the words used for pen, סלמן, (κάλαμος), and writer, לבלר (*librarius*).¹⁵⁵

But it was in the department of *trade*, of *industry*, and all connected therewith, and in that of the necessities of daily life, that the influence of Hellenism made itself the most forcibly noticeable. By their ancient commerce with the Phoenicians the coast lands of the Mediterranean had already entered into active intercourse with each other.¹⁵⁶ While, however, in ancient times the Phoenicians had the preponderance as givers, the Orientals now more occupied the position of receivers. At least it was the Graeco-Roman element which was now the intermediary and influential factor in the general commerce of the world. This is plainly shown in the trade and commerce of Judæo-Palestine.¹⁵⁷ Already are the tech-

vii. 4. See in general Löw, *Die Lebensalter*, p. 323 sqq. Hermann and Blümner, *Griech. Privatalterthümer*, p. 511 sqq. Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, ii. 824 sqq.

¹⁵⁵ סלמן, *Shabbath* i. 3, viii. 5. לבלר, *Pea* ii. 6; *Shabbath* i. 3; *Gittin* iii. 1.

¹⁵⁶ On the commerce of the Phoenicians, see especially the classic work of Movers (*Die Phönicië*), the last part of which (ii. 3, 1856) is entirely devoted to this subject. On the influence thereby exerted upon Western by Eastern culture, see the literature in Hermann and Blümner, *Griechische Privatalterthümer* (1882), p. 41 sq., and in Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, vol. ii. (1882), p. 378 sqq.

¹⁵⁷ On Jewish commerce, see especially Herzfeld, *Handelsgeschichte der Juden des Alterthums* (1879); and for a short account, Winer, *RWB.* i. 458 sqq. Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. v. 578 sqq., xiii. 513 sqq. (art. "Schiffahrt"). De Wette, *Lehrb. der hebr.-jüd. Archäologie* (Rabiger, 4th ed.), p. 390 sqq. Keil, *Handb. der bibl. Archäol.* (2nd ed. 1875) p. 599 sqq. Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. art. "Welthandel." For an acquaintance with Oriental commerce in general, in the first century after Christ, one of the most important and interesting authorities is the *Περὶ πλοῦς τῆς ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης* (probably composed by a contemporary of Pliny about 70–75 after Christ). Comp. on the Periplus, especially Schwanbeck, *Rhein. Museum*, new series, vol. vii. 1850, pp. 321–369, 481–511. Dillmann, *Monthly Report of the Berlin Academy*, 1879, pp. 413–427. Jurien de la Gravière, *Le commerce de l'Orient sous les règnes d'Auguste et de Claude* (*Revue des deux mondes*, 1883, Nov. 15, pp. 312–355). The text is given in Müller's *Geographi Graeci minores*, vol. i. 1855, pp. 257–305 (see also the Proleg., p. xcvi. sqq.). The separate publication, Fabricius, *The Periplus of the Red Sea*, by an unknown traveller, in Greek and German, with critical and explanatory notes, and a complete glossary of words. Leipzig 1883 (in this work is given, pp. 1–27, the rest of the literature).

nical designations of the commercial class partly Greek. A corn-dealer is called סִיטָן (*σιτώνης*), a sole dealer, מִנְפֹּל (*μονοπώλης*), a retail dealer, פֶּלְטֵר (*πρατήρ*),¹⁵⁸ a merchant's account-book is called פִּנְקָס (*πίναξ*).¹⁵⁹ The whole *coinage system* of Palestine was partly the Phoenician-Hellenistic, partly the entirely Greek or Roman.¹⁶⁰ Reckonings were made in Palestine in the time of the Maccabees by drachmas and talents.¹⁶¹ During the period of independence the Asmonean princes certainly issued money of their own, coined according to a native (Phoenician) standard, and with Hebrew inscriptions. But the later Asmoneans already added Greek inscriptions also. Of the Herodians only coins of Roman values with Greek inscriptions are known. In the period of Roman supremacy the Roman system of coins was fully carried out, nay even the Roman *names* of coins were then more current than the Hebrew and Greek ones, which were used simultaneously. This is seen by the following comparison of the material afforded by the Mishna and the New Testament.¹⁶² (1) The Palestinian gold coin is the Roman *aureus* of 25 denarii, often

¹⁵⁸ סִיטָן, *Demai* ii. 4, v. 6; *Baba bathra* v. 10; *Kelim* xii. 1; מִנְפֹּל, *Demai* v. 4; *Aboda sara* iv. 9; on *σιτώνης* and *μονοπώλης*, see also Herzfeld, p. 135 sq. פֶּלְטֵר is in some places = *πωλητήριον*, the place of sale; and Herzfeld (pp. 131, 132) insists on so understanding it in the two passages quoted; but it is more probably = *πρατήρ* (so Hartmann, *Thes. ling. Hebr. e Mischna aug.* p. 45).

¹⁵⁹ פִּנְקָס, *Shabbath* xii. 4; *Shebuoth* vii. 1. 5; *Aboth* iii. 16; *Kelim* xvii. 17, xxiv. 7. This account-book consisted of two tablets bound together, which could be opened and closed.

¹⁶⁰ On the Jewish coinage of earlier and later times, see Bertheau, *Zur Geschichte der Israeliten* (1842), pp. 1-49. Zuckermann, *Ueber talmudische Gewichte und Münzen*, 1862. Herzfeld, *Metrologische Voruntersuchungen zu einer Geschichte des ibräischen resp. altjüdischen Handels*, 2 parts, 1863-1865. The same, *Handelsgeschichte der Juden* (1879), pp. 171-185. Winer, *RWB. art.* "Gold;" also the articles Denar, Drachme, Stater, Sekel. De Wette, *Lehrb. der hebr.-jüdischen Archäol.* (4th ed. 1864) p. 251 sqq. The works of De Saulcy, Madden, and others on Jewish coins; see above, § 2. Hultsch, *Griechische und römische Metrologie* (1882), pp. 456 sqq., 602 sqq.

¹⁶¹ Drachmas, 2 Macc. iv. 19, x. 20, xii. 43. Talents, 1 Macc. xi. 28, xiii. 16, 19, xv. 31, 35; 2 Macc. iii. 11, iv. 8, 24, v. 21, viii. 10 sq. What standard is to be assumed in this case must here be left uncertain.

¹⁶² On the coins named in the New Testament, see Madden, *History*

mentioned in the Mishna under the name of the "gold denarius" (דינר זהב).¹⁶³ (2) The current silver coin was the *denarius* (δηνάριον), which is the most frequently named of all coins in the New Testament (Matt. xviii. 28, xx. 2 sqq., xxii. 19; Mark vi. 37, xii. 15, xiv. 5; Luke vii. 41, x. 35, xx. 24; John vi. 7, xii. 5; Rev. vi. 6). That this Latin designation is familiar to the Mishna is very evident, for it is here almost more frequently mentioned by the expression דינר than by its Semitic equivalent דנן.¹⁶⁴ The denarius being esteemed equal in value to an Attic drachma, calculations were still made by drachmas. Still this mode of computation was no longer frequent.¹⁶⁵ (3) Of copper coins, the two *as* piece, or *dupondius* (Hebr. פונדיון), is chiefly mentioned.¹⁶⁶ Such a dupondius is also meant in the saying of Christ, Luke xii. 6, where the Vulgate rightly translates ἀσσαρίων δύο by *dupondio*. (4) The most common copper coin was the *as*, Greek ἀσσαρίον (Matt. x. 29; Luke xii. 6), Hebr. אסר, sometimes expressly designated

of Jewish Coinage (1864), pp. 232-248; Winer and De Wette's above-mentioned works. On the Roman coinage, comp. especially the excellent summary in Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. ii. (1876), pp. 3-75. The two chief modern works are Mommsen, *Gesch. des römischen Münzwesens*, 1860, and Hultsch, *Griechische und römische Metrologie*, 1882.

¹⁶³ דינר זהב, *Maaser sheni* ii. 7, iv. 9; *Shekalim* vi. 6; *Nasir* v. 2; *Baba kamma* iv. 1; *Shebuoth* vi. 3; *Meila* vi. 4. On the Roman aureus (called also *denarius aureus*), see Marquardt, ii. 25 sq.; Hultsch, p. 308 sqq. That the דינר זהב was equal to 25 denarii appears, e.g., from *Kethuboth* x. 4; *Baba kamma* iv. 1.

¹⁶⁴ דינר, e.g. *Pea* viii. 8; *Demai* ii. 5; *Maaser sheni* ii. 9; *Shekalim* ii. 4; *Beza* iii. 7; *Kethuboth* v. 7, vi. 3, 4, x. 2; *Kiddushin* i. 1, ii. 2; *Baba mezia* iv. 5; *Arachin* vi. 2, 5, and elsewhere. דנן, *Pea* viii. 8, 9; *Jama* iii. 7; *Kethuboth* i. 5, vi. 5, ix. 8; *Gittin* vii. 5; *Kiddushin* iii. 2; *Baba kamma* iv. 1, viii. 6; *Baba bathra* x. 2.

¹⁶⁵ δραχμή, Luke xv. 8 sq.; Joseph. *Vita*, 44. In both passages, however, drachmae of Tyrian value may be intended; comp. below, note 172.

¹⁶⁶ פונדיון, *Pea* viii. 7; *Shebiith* viii. 4; *Maaser sheni* iv. 8; *Erubin* viii. 2; *Baba mezia* iv. 5; *Baba bathra* v. 9; *Shebuoth* vi. 3; *Kelim* xvii. 12 (in the last expressly named as the Italian pondion (פונדיון איטלקי)). From *Baba bathra* v. 9, it is evident that a pondion = two asses, as is also expressly noticed in the Talmud (*jer. Kiddushin* 58^d; *bab. Kiddushin* 12^a; Lightfoot, *Horae hebr.* on Matt. v. 26, *Opp.* ii. 288 sq.). The pondion is therefore without doubt the Roman *dupondius*, as Guisius on *Pea* viii. 7 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna* i. 7) has remarked.

as the Italian *as*, אסר איטלקי.¹⁶⁷ It amounted originally to one-tenth, but after the second Punic war (B.C. 217), to only one-sixteenth of a denarius.¹⁶⁸ (5) The smallest copper coin was the פרוטה, amounting to only the eighth of an *as*.¹⁶⁹ It was unknown to the Roman system of coinage, its name too is Semitic. The λεπτόν however which occurs in the New Testament (Mark xii. 42; Luke xii. 59, xxi. 2), and is, according to Mark xii. 42, the half of a quadrans, is identical with it. Coins of this size are in fact found in the period of the later Asmoneans and single ones in the Herodian-Romish period.¹⁷⁰ It is however striking, that both in the Mishna and the New Testament reckonings are made by this smallest portion of the *as*, and not by the *semis* (half *as*) and *quadrans* (quarter *as*), while the latter were then coined in Palestine also, and indeed more frequently than the λεπτόν.¹⁷¹ The mode of reckoning seems, according to the latter, to have come down from pre-Roman times, but to have remained in use even after the introduction of the Roman valuation. The coins issued in the Phoenician towns, especially in Tyre, which were in circulation in Palestine even when no more were made according to this standard, differed in value from the Roman coins.¹⁷²

¹⁶⁷ אסר איטלקי, *Kiddushin* i. 1; *Edujoth* iv. 7; *Chullin* iii. 2; *Mikwaoth* ix. 5. On אסר in general, e.g. *Pea* viii. 1; *Shebiith* viii. 4; *Maaser-oth* ii. 5, 6; *Maaser sheni* iv. 3, 8; *Erubin* vii. 10; *Baba mezia* iv. 5; *Baba bathra* v. 9.

¹⁶⁸ Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, ii. 16.

¹⁶⁹ פרוטה, *Kiddushin* i. 1, ii. 1, 6; *Baba kamma* ix. 5, 6, 7; *Baba mezia* iv. 78; *Shebuoth* vi. 1, 3; *Edujoth* iv. 7. That it amounted to the eighth of the *as* is said *Kiddushin* i. 1; *Edujoth* iv. 7.

¹⁷⁰ See Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage*, p. 301.

¹⁷¹ See Madden, as above. The *semis* and *quadrans* are not to my knowledge mentioned in the Mishna, but first occur in the Jerusalemite and Babylonian Talmud. In the New Testament indeed the *quadrans* (κοδράντης) is twice mentioned. But in one passage (Mark xii. 42) the words ὁ ἐστὶν κοδράντης are only an explanation on the part of the evangelist; in the other (Matt. v. 26) the expression κοδράντης was probably inserted by the evangelist in place of λεπτόν offered by his authority, and preserved by St. Luke (xii. 59). The authorities therefore of our Gospels mention only the λεπτόν, as the Mishna mentions only the פרוטה.

¹⁷² The coins of Phoenician valuation were somewhat lighter than the

That which applies to money, the medium of commerce, applies also to its *objects*. Here too we everywhere come upon the track of Greek and Roman names and matters.¹⁷³ At the same time we must not overlook the fact, that Palestine with her abundance of natural products made on her part large contributions to the commerce of the world; the produce of her soil and her industrial commodities went into all lands and were some of them world-famed.¹⁷⁴ But whether the

Roman; see Hultsch, *Griech. und röm. Metrologie*, p. 594 sqq. A νόμισμα ῥύριον, of the value of 4 drachmae, is mentioned by Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 2; comp. *Vita*, 13, s. *fin.* The δίδραχμον (Matt. xvii. 24) and the στατήρ (= 4 drachmae, Matt. xvii. 27) are coins of this valuation; for the temple tribute, as well as those generally prescribed in the A. T., were discharged according to Tyrian valuation (*Mishna Bechoroth* viii. 7; *Tosefta Kethuboth* xii. *fin.*), because this corresponded to the Hebrew; comp. Hultsch, pp. 604 sq., 471. When Josephus states the value of the νόμισμα ῥύριον to have been 4 Attic drachmae, this is but an approximate valuation, for the Tyrian tetradrachmon was somewhat lighter than the Attic (Hultsch, 595 sq.).

¹⁷³ On the commercial commodities of antiquity, see especially Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, vol. ii., Leipzig 1882 (2nd ed. of the *römischen Privatalterthümer*, vol. ii.). Karl Friedr. Hermann and H. Blümner, *Lehrb. der griechischen Privatalterthümer*, Freiburg 1882. Büchsenenschütz, *Die Hauptstätten des Gewerbflusses im klassischen Alterthum*, Leipzig 1869. On the products of Egypt in particular, Lumbroso, *Recherches sur l'économie politique de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*, Turin 1870. On the arts of the Restoration, Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*, vols. i.-iii., Leipzig 1875-1884. The *Edictum Diocletiani de pretiis rerum* (1st ed.) given—(1) by Mommsen in the reports of the *Saxon Scientific Society*, *phil.-hist. Cl.* vol. iii. 1851, pp. 1-80, with Appendix, pp. 383-400; (2) by Waddington in *Le Bas et Waddington*, *Inscr.* vol. iii., *Explications*, pp. 145-191; (3) by Mommsen in *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. iii. 2, pp. 801-841, is a copious source of information concerning goods. I quote from Waddington's edition.

¹⁷⁴ On the commercial commodities of Palestine, see Movers, *Die Phönicië*, ii. 3 (1856), pp. 200-235; Herzfeld, *Handels-gesch. der Juden*, pp. 88-117; Blümner, *Die gewerbliche Thätigkeit*, etc., pp. 24-27. A survey of the chief commodities in the fourth century after Christ is given in the *Totius orbis descriptio* in Müller, *Geographi gr. minores*, ii. 513 sqq. c. 29. Ascalon et Gaza in negotiis eminentes et abundantes omnibus bonis mittunt omni regioni Syriæ et Aegypti vinum optimum . . . c. 31: Quoniam ergo ex parte supra dictas descripsimus civitates, necessarium mihi videtur, ut etiam quidnam unaquæque civitas proprium habeat exponamus, ut qui legit, certam eorum scientiam habere possit. Scythopolis igitur, Laodicia, Byblus, Tyrus, Berytus omni mundo linteamen emittunt; Sarepta vero,

commodities were produced in the land or introduced from abroad, they equally bore in large proportion the impress of the prevalent Hellenistic culture; the produce of the interior was regulated by its requirements, while just the objects which were the fashion in all the world were those which were imported into Palestine.¹⁷⁵

A series of examples from the three departments of (1) provisions (2), clothing and (3) furniture may serve as a further illustration. Of foreign provisions, *e.g.*, there were known in Palestine Babylonian sauce (פִּיטָח), Median beer (אֶשְׁכִּי), Edomite vinegar (חֹמֶץ) and Egyptian zythos (זִיתוֹס).¹⁷⁶ Also other Egyptian products, viz. fish,¹⁷⁷ mustard, kûrbis,

Caesarea, Neapolis et Lydda purpuram praestant; omnes autem fructiferae vino, oleo et frumento; Nicolaum vero palmulam invenies abundare in Palaestina regione, in loco qui dicitur Hiericho, similiter et Damasci minores palmulas, sed utiles, et pistacium et omne genus pomorum. Especially famous was the linen manufacture of Scythopolis. In the *Edictum Diocl.* c. xvii.-xviii., the linen goods of Scythopolis stand first as the most expensive. See also *Jer. Kiddushin* ii. 5: כָּל פֶּשֶׁתִּין הָרָקִים הֵבְאִין מִבֵּית שָׁאן, Movers, ii. 3, 217 sq. Herzfeld, p. 107. Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, ii. 466. Büchschütz, p. 61. Blümner, *Die gewerbl. Thätigkeit*, p. 25. The Mishna too assumes, that Galilee carried on chiefly the manufacture of linen, and Judea on the contrary that of woollen goods (*Babakamma* x. 9). Hence there was a wool-market at Jerusalem.

¹⁷⁵ On imported articles, see also Herzfeld, *Handelsgeschichte*, pp. 117-129.

¹⁷⁶ All four are mentioned, *Pesachim* iii. 1, as examples of provisions, which are prepared from kinds of grain and have gone through a process of fermentation. On the Egyptian ζῖθος (a kind of beer, Hebr. זִיתוֹס, not זִיתוֹם, see Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterbuch*, s.v.), comp. Theophrast. *de caus. plant.* vi. 11. 2. Diodor. i. 34. Plinius, xxii. 164. Strabo, xvii. p. 824. *Digest.* xxxiii. 6, 9. *Edict. Diocletiani*, ii. 12. Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. s.v.* Waddington's explanations to the *Edict. Diocl.* p. 154. Pauly's *Encykl. s.v. cerevisia*. Marquardt, *Privatleben der Römer*, ii. 444. Hermann and Blümner, *Griech. Privatleben*, p. 235. Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere* (3rd ed. 1877), p. 136 sq. Schleusner's *Lexicon in LXX. s.v.* and the Lexicons generally. It also occurs in the Greek translations of the Old Testament Isa. xix. 10.

¹⁷⁷ *Machshirin* vi. 3. Pickled fish (τράπηνη), which are produced in large quantities in different places in Egypt, and formed a considerable article of exportation, are intended (Blümner, *Die gewerbl. Thätigkeit*, etc., pp. 14, 17. Lumbroso, *Recherches*, p. 133. The expositors of Num. xi. 5). A large number of places on the Egyptian coast had the name of Ταραχίαι from this branch of industry (Steph. Byz. s.v.). See, concerning its wide diffusion, Marquardt, *Privatleben der Römer*, ii. 420 sqq., and the chief

beans, lentils.¹⁷⁸ Likewise Cilician groats,¹⁷⁹ Bithynian cheese,¹⁸⁰ Greek pumpkins,¹⁸¹ Greek and Roman hyssop,¹⁸² and Spanish kolias.¹⁸³ From abroad came also, as their foreign names show, *e.g.* asparagus, lupines and Persian nuts.¹⁸⁴ Very widely diffused in Palestine was the custom of salting fish or pickling them in brine, as the name of the town *Tαριχέαι* on the Lake of Gennesareth and the frequent mention of brine (*muries*) in the Mishna prove.¹⁸⁵ The foreign origin of this custom also is evident from its foreign name.

Of materials for dress and garments of foreign origin the following are mentioned: Pelusian and Indian linen and cotton fabrics,¹⁸⁶

work there cited, *viz.* Köhler, *Τάριχος ou recherches sur l'histoire et les antiquités des pêcheries de la Russie méridionale (Mémoires de l'Académie imp. des sciences de St. Petersbourg, vi. serie, vol. i. 1832, pp. 347-490).*

¹⁷⁸ Mustard (חֲרָדֵל), *Kilajim* i. 2. Pumpkins (דִּלְעָת), *Kilajim* i. 2, 5. Beans (פּוֹל), *Kilajim* i. 2, ii. 11, iii. 4; *Shebi'ith* ii. 8, 9; *Shabbath* ix. 7; *Nedarim* vii. 1, 2. Lentils (עֲרִשְׁיִים), *Maaseroth* v. 8; *Kelim* xvii. 8. Egyptian lentils were known also in Rome, see Plinius, xvi. 201; Marquardt, ii. 410. Their cultivation in Egypt is of ancient date, see Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere* (3rd ed.), p. 188.

¹⁷⁹ גִּרִּים קִילִקִּי, *Maaseroth* v. 8; *Kelim* xvii. 12; *Negaim* vi. 1.

¹⁸⁰ גְּבִינָה וְתַנְיִיקִי, *Aboda sara* ii. 4 (for thus we should here read, according to the best authorities, instead of the corrupt גְּבִינָת בֵּית אוֹנִיִּיקִי). Bithynian cheese is also spoken of, Plinius, xi. 241: *trans maria vero Bithynus fere in gloria est.*

¹⁸¹ דִּלְעָת יוֹנִית, *Kilajim* i. 5, ii. 11; *Orla* iii. 7; *Ohaloth* viii. 1.

¹⁸² יוֹן אֶזוֹב וְרוֹמִי אֶזוֹב, *Negaim* xiv. 6; *Para* xi. 7. The former also *Shabbath* xiv. 3.

¹⁸³ קוֹלִיִּים הָאֶסְפֵּן, *Shabbath* xxii. 2; *Machshirin* vi. 3. The colias is a kind of tunny-fish (see concerning it Plinius, xxxii. 146; Marquardt, ii. 422 and the Lexicons). It was of course salted for commerce and was like the Spanish *τάρικος* everywhere well known (Marquardt, ii. 421; Blümner, pp. 130-135).

¹⁸⁴ Asparagus (אֶסְפָּרַגוֹס, ἀσπαράγος), *Nedarim* vi. 10. Lupines (תּוֹרֵמוֹס, θέρμος), *Shabbath* xviii. 1; *Machshirin* iv. 6; *Tebul jom.* i. 4. Persian nuts (אֶפְרֶסְקִי, Περσική), *Kilajim* i. 4; *Maaseroth* i. 2. In both places, as the context shows, not peaches, but Persian nuts are meant, on which comp. Marquardt, ii. 411.

¹⁸⁵ מְוִרִיִּים, *Terumoth* xi. 1; *Joma* viii. 3; *Nedarim* vi. 1; *Aboda sara* ii. 4; *Kelim* x. 5.

¹⁸⁶ The garments worn by the high priest on the Day of Atonement were, according to *Joma* iii. 7, made of both materials. In the morning he wore the פִּלּוֹסִין, in the afternoon the הַנְדוּוִין (whether these were of

Cilician haircloth,¹⁸⁷ the *sagum* (סגום), the *dalmatica* (דלמטיקין), the *paragandion* (פרגוד), the *stola* (אצטלית),¹⁸⁸ the handkerchief (סודרין, σουδάριον),¹⁸⁹ the felt hat (פליון, πιλίου), the felt socks (אמפליא, ἐμπίλια), the sandals (סנדל), of which the Laodicean (סנדל לדיקי) are mentioned as a special kind.¹⁹⁰

linen or cotton is not shown by these designations). The fine *linen of Pelusium* was famous; see Plinius, xix. 1. 14: Aegyptio lino minimum firmitatis, plurimum lucri. Quattuor ibi genera: Taniticum ac *Pelusiacum*, Buticum, Tentyriticum. Movers, ii. 3. 318. Büchschütz, 62 sq. Blümner, *Die gewerbliche Thätigkeit*, p. 6 sqq., especially 16.—Indian materials (ἰνδόνιον 'Ινδικόν, ἰνδόνη 'Ινδική, σινδόνες 'Ινδικαί) are e.g. also frequently mentioned in the *Periplus maris Erythraei* (see above, note 157) as articles of commerce (§ 6, 31, 41, 48, 63). Probably cotton goods are to be understood. See Marquardt, ii. 472 sq. Fabricius, *Der Periplus des erythräischen Meeres* (1883), p. 123, and Brand's article, "Ueber die antiken Namen und die geographische Verbreitung der Baumwolle im Alterthum" (1866), quoted in both these two works.

¹⁸⁷ קילקי, *Kelim* xxix. 1.—*Cilicium* was a cloth made of goat's hair, and used for very various purposes (coarse cloaks, curtains, covers, etc.). See Marquardt, ii. 463; Büchschütz, 64; Blümner, 30. If then St. Paul was a *ταπηνοποιός* of Tarsus in Cilicia (Acts xviii. 3), his calling was closely connected with the chief manufacture of his native place. In the Mishna קילקי is called "felt" (*Filz*), e.g. matted (*verfilztes*) hair on the beard, chest, etc. (*Mikwaoth* ix. 2).

¹⁸⁸ סגום, *Kelim* xxix. 1; *Mikwaoth* vii. 6. דלמטיקין, *Kilajim* ix. 7. פרגוד, *Shekalim* iii. 2; *Kelim* xxix. 1. אצטלית, *Joma* vii. 1; *Gittin* vii. 5. For particulars respecting this piece of clothing, see Marquardt, ii. 584 sq., 563 sq., 536 sq. Waddington, explanations to the *Edict. Dioclet.* pp. 175 sq., 182, 174 sq. Mommsen, *Reports of the Saxon Scientific Society, phil.-hist. Cl.* iii. 71, 391.—The *sagum* was a mantle which left the arm at liberty, and was therefore especially worn by soldiers and artisans. The three others are different kinds of underclothing (hence in the Armenian translation of the Bible *paregôt* more frequently occurs for *χιτών*; see Lagarde, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1866, p. 209 sq.). The *dalmatica* is also mentioned in Epiphan. *Haer.*, when speaking of the garments of the scribes.

¹⁸⁹ סודרין, *Shabbath* iii. 3; *Joma* vi. 8; *Sanhedrin* vi. 1; *Tamid* vii. 3; *Kelim* xxix. 1. In the New Testament, Luke xix. 20; John xi. 44, xx. 7; Acts xix. 12. Much matter concerning it is also found in Wetstein, *Nov. Test.* on Luke xix. 20, and in the Lexicons.

¹⁹⁰ פליון, *Kelim* xxix. 1; *Nidda* viii. 1. אמפליא, *Jebamoth* xii. 1; *Kelim* xxvii. 6 (comp. Marquardt, ii. 486; Waddington, p. 164; Mommsen, p. 71). סנדל, e.g. *Shabbath* vi. 2, 5, x. 3, xv. 2; *Shekalim* iii. 2; *Beza* i. 10; *Megilla* iv. 8; *Jebamoth* xii. 1; *Arachin* vi. 5. The sandal-maker was called סנדלר, *Jebamoth* xii. 5; *Kethuboth* v. 4; *Aboth* iv. 11; *Kelim* v. 5. See on sandals in general, Marquardt, ii. 577 sq.; Hermann and Blümner, *Griechische Privatalterthümer*, pp. 181, 196. סנדל לדיקי, *Kelim* xxvi. 1.

A series too of technical expressions in the department of manufactured articles testifies to the influence of Greek models. The spun thread is called נִימָא (νήμα), a certain arrangement of the loom קִירוֹם (καίρος),¹⁹¹ the tanner בורסי (βυρσεύς).¹⁹² Of raw materials, hemp (e.g. קנבוס, κάνναβος, κάνναβις) was first introduced into Palestine by the Greeks.¹⁹³

Domestic utensils of foreign, especially of Greek and Roman origin, are everywhere plentiful. Of Egyptian utensils, a basket, a ladder, and a rope are mentioned,¹⁹⁴ also a Tyrian ladder,¹⁹⁵ Sidonian dishes or bowls.¹⁹⁶ Of Greek and Roman utensils we find the bench (ספסל, *subsellium*), the arm-chair (קתדרא, καθέδρα), the curtain (וילן, *velum*), the mirror (אספקלריא, *specularia*), the Corinthian candlestick.¹⁹⁷ For eating and drinking, e.g. the plate (אסקוטלא, *scutella*), the bowl (פילי, φιάλη), the table-cloth (מפה, *mappa*).¹⁹⁸ For cases

Which Laodicea is meant cannot be ascertained, probably the Phrygian, which was famed for its manufactures (*Edict. Diocl.*; Marquardt, ii. 460; Büchschütz, p. 65; Blümner, pp. 27, 28). The Syrian Laodicea was chiefly famous for its linen manufacture (*Edict. Diocl. xvii.-xviii.*; Marquardt, ii. 466; Büchschütz, p. 61; Blümner, p. 26).

¹⁹¹ נִימָא, *Erubin* x. 13; *Shekalim* viii. 5; *Kelim* xix. 1, xxix. 1; *Negaim* xi. 10. קִירוֹם, *Shabbath* xiii. 2; *Kelim* xxi. 1. Comp. on the *καίρος*, especially Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste*, i. 126 sqq.

¹⁹² בורסי, *Kethuboth* vii. 10. בורסי (the tan-yard), *Shabbath* i. 2; *Baba bathra* ii. 9.

¹⁹³ קנבוס, *Kilajim* v. 8, ix. 1, 7; *Negaim* xi. 2. On the comparatively late diffusion of hemp, see Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen u. Haustiere* (3rd ed.), p. 168 sq.

¹⁹⁴ Basket (בַּפִּיפָה), *Shabbath* xx. 2; *Sota* ii. 1, iii. 1; *Kelim* xxvi. 1. The reading also of *Tebul jom*. iv. 2 is certainly כַּפִּישָׁה instead of כַּפִּיפָה. Ladder (סֵלֶם), *Baba bathra* iii. 6; *Sabim* iii. 1, 3, iv. 3. Rope (חֶבֶל), *Sota* i. 6.

¹⁹⁵ *Baba bathra* iii. 6; *Sabim* iii. 3.

¹⁹⁶ *Kelim* iv. 3. קוסיס, comp. the Biblical קֶסֶת. Glass vessels are certainly meant; for the making of glass vessels formed in Roman times a main branch of Sidonian industry. Plinius, *H. N.* v. 19. 76: Sidon artifex vitri. Hermann and Blümner, *Griech. Privatalterthümer*, p. 437 sq. Marquardt, *Privatleben*, ii. 726.

¹⁹⁷ ספסל, *Baba bathra* iv. 6; *Sanhedrin* ii. 1, *fin.*; *Kelim* ii. 3, xxii. 3; *Mikwaoth* v. 2; *Sabim* iv. 4. Comp. Marquardt, ii. 704. קתדרא, *Kethuboth* v. 5; *Kelim* iv. 3, xxii. 3; Marquardt, ii. 705. וילן, *Kelim* xx. 6, xxiv. 13. אספקלריא, *Kelim* xxx. 2. Corinthian candlesticks in the possession of King Agrippa, Joseph. *Vita*, 13.

¹⁹⁸ סטבלא, *Shabbath* xxi. 3; *Beza* i. 8; *Moed katan* iii. 7; *Edujoth* iii. 9

of all kinds the most common designation is תי, *θήκη*.¹⁹⁹ Special kinds of wooden vessels are the cask or box (קופה, *cupa*), the wine-barrel (פיטס, *πίθος*),²⁰⁰ the chest (גלוסקמא, *γλωσσόκομον*), the small chest (קמטרא, *κάμπτρα*), the casket (קפסא, *capsa*), the sack (מרצוף, *μαρσύπιον*).²⁰¹

The stock of Greek and Latin words in the Mishna is far from being exhausted by the specimens quoted. They suffice however to give a vivid impression of the full adoption of Western manners and customs even in Palestine in the second century after Christ. The influence of the Greek language reached still farther. For even in cases where the introduction of Western productions and notions is not treated of, we meet with the use of Greek words in the Mishna. The air is called אויר (*ἀήρ*),²⁰² the form טופס (*τύπος*), the sample or pattern דונמא (*δεύγμα*),²⁰³ an ignorant, a non-professional, or a private individual הריוט (*ἰδιώτης*), a dwarf ננס (*νάννος*), a robber לסטים (*λῃστής*).²⁰⁴ For the notion "weak" or "ill"

(טבלא elsewhere means a marble slab in the floor, *Sota* ii. 2, *Middoth* i. 9, iii. 3, or a tablet with pictures, *Rosh hashana*, ii. 8). אסקוטלא, *Moed katan* ii. 7; *Kelim* xxx. 1. פילי, *Sota* ii. 2; Marquardt, ii. 632. מפא, *Berachoth* viii. 3; Marquardt, ii. 469.

¹⁹⁹ תי, *Shabbath* xvi. 1; *Kelim* xvi. 7, 8.

²⁰⁰ קופה (any round hollow vessel, cask, basket, box), *Pea* viii. 7; *Demai* ii. 5; *Shabbath* viii. 2, xviii. 1; *Shekalim* iii. 2; *Kethuboth* vi. 4; *Kelim* xvi. 3; *Ohaloth* vi. 2; *Machshirai* iv. 6, vi. 3. פיטס (more correctly פיתס), *Baba mezia* iv. 12; *Baba bathra* vi. 2; *Kelim* iii. 6; Marquardt, ii. 45, 626 sq. Hermann and Blümner, *Privatalterthümer*, p. 162.

²⁰¹ גלוסקמא, *Gittin* iii. 3; *Baba mezia* i. 8; *Meila* vi. 1; *Ohaloth* ix. 15. According to the latter passage a coffin might have the form of a *γλωσσόκομον* or a *κάμπτρα*. The LXX. (2 Chron. xxiv. 8, 10, 11) put *γλωσσόκομον* for *ארון*. In the New Testament (John xii. 6, xiii. 29) *γλωσσόκομον* is a money-box. See on all these meanings, Wetstein, *Nov. Test.* on John xii. 6, and the Lexicons. קמטרא, *Kelim* xvi. 7; *Ohaloth* ix. 15. קפסא, *Kelim* xvi. 7; Marquardt, ii. 705 sq. מרצוף, *Shabbath* viii. 5; *Kelim* xx. 1.

²⁰² אויר, *Shabbath* 3; *Chagiga* i. 8; *Kethuboth* xiii. 7; *Gittin* viii. 3; *Kinnim* ii. 1; *Kelim* i. 1, ii. 1, 8, iii. 4, and elsewhere; *Ohaloth* iii. 3, iv. 1; *Sabim* v. 9.

²⁰³ טופס, e.g. the different shapes of the loaf (*Demai* v. 3, 4), or the shape in which the loaf was baked (*Menachoth* xi. 1), or the holder for the Tephillin (*Kelim* xvi. 7), or the formula for the bill of divorcement (*Gittin* iii. 2, ix. 5). דונמא, *Shabbath* x. 1, a specimen of seeds.

²⁰⁴ הריוט used very frequently in the most different relations, e.g. of a

the Greek expression אסטנים (*ἀσθενής*) for steep קטפרם (*καταφερός*) is used.²⁰⁵ The employment also of Greek and Latin proper names is pretty frequent even among the lower classes and the Pharisaic scribes. Not only were the aristocratic high priests, who were on friendly terms with the Greeks, called Jason and Alexander (in the Maccabean period), Boethus and Theophilus (in the Herodian period), not only did the Asmonean and Herodian princes bear the names of Alexander, Aristobulus, Antigonus, Herod, Archelaus, Philip, Antipas, Agrippa, but among men of the common people also, as the apostles of Christ, names such as Andrew and Philip appear. And in the circles of the Rabbinical scribes we find an Antigonus of Socho, a R. Dosthai (= Dositheus), a R. Dosaben Archinos (for such and not Harkinias was the Greek name of his father), R. Chananiah ben Antigonus, R. Tarphon (= Tryphon), R. Papias, Symmachus. Latin names also were early naturalized. The John Mark mentioned in the New Testament was, according to Acts xii. 12, a Palestinian; so too was Joseph Barsabas, whose surname was Justus (Acts i. 23). Josephus mentions besides the well-known Justus of Tiberius, also *e.g.* ■ Niger of Peræa.^{205a}

But all that has been said does not prove that the Greek language also was familiar to the common people of Palestine. However large the number of Greek words which had penetrated into the Hebrew and Aramaic, an acquaintance with

layman as distinguished from a professional craftsman (*Moed katan* i. 8, 10), or of a private individual in distinction from a ruler or official (*Nedarim* v. 5; *Sanhedrim* x. 2; *Gittin* i. 5); also of ordinary priests as distinguished from the high priest (*Jebamoth* ii. 4, vi. 2, 3, 5, vii. 1, ix. 1, 2, 3). ננס, *Bechoroth* vii. 6, and in the proper name ננס בן שמעון, *Bikkurim* iii. 9; *Shabbath* xvi. 5, and elsewhere; also of animals (*Para* ii. 2) and objects (*Tamid* iii. 5; *Middoth* iii. 5). לטמים, usually in the plural לטמים, *Berachoth* i. 3; *Pea* ii. 7, 8; *Shabbath* ii. 5; *Pesachim* iii. 7; *Nasir* vi. 3; *Baba kamma* vi. 1, x. 2.

²⁰⁵ אסטנים, *Berachoth* ii. 6; *Joma* iii. 5. קטפרם, *Ohaloth* iii. 3; *Tohoroth* viii. 8, 9.

^{205a} Compare in general, Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii., article "Namen."

Greek by the mass of the people is not thereby proved. In fact, it must be assumed, that the lower classes in Palestine possessed either no knowledge, or only an insufficient one of Greek. When the Apostle Paul wanted to speak to the people in Jerusalem, he made use of the Hebrew (Aramaic?) tongue (Acts **xxi.** 40, **xxii.** 2). When Titus during the siege of Jerusalem repeatedly summoned the besieged to surrender, this was always done in Aramaic, whether Titus commissioned Josephus to speak, or spoke in his own name by the help of an interpreter.²⁰⁶ Thus the incidental knowledge of Greek on the part of the people was in any case by no means an adequate one. On the other hand it is probable, that a slight acquaintance with Greek was pretty widely diffused, and that the more educated classes used it without difficulty.²⁰⁷ Hellenistic districts not only surrounded Palestine on almost every side, but also pushed far into the interior (Samaria, Scythopolis). Constant contact with them was inevitable. And it is not conceivable, that this should continue without the diffusion of a certain amount of knowledge of the Greek language in Palestine also. To this must be added, that the country, both before and after the Asmonean period, was under rulers, whose education was a Greek one: first under the Ptolemies and Seleucidæ, then

²⁰⁶ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* v. 9. 2, vi. 2. 1. Interpreter, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 6. 2. If it sometimes appears as though Titus had spoken directly to the people (*Bell. Jud.* v. 9. 2, vi. 2. 4), we see from the latter passages that this is only in appearance, and that Josephus had to interpret his speech (*Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 5, *init.*).

²⁰⁷ The question respecting the diffusion of Greek in Palestine has been much discussed both in ancient and modern times. The copious literature is recorded in Hase, *Leben Jesu*, § 29, note b. Credner, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, p. 183. Volbeding, *Index Dissertationum quibus singuli historiae N. T. etc. loci illustrantur* (Lips. 1849), p. 18. Danko, *Historia Revelationis divinae Nov. Test.* (Vindob. 1867) p. 216 sq. Of more modern times, Hug, *Einkl. in die Schriften des N. T.* (4th ed. 1847) ii. 27-49. Rettig, *Ephemerides exegetico-theologicae fasc. iii.* (Gissæ 1824) pp. 1-5. Thiersch, *Versuch zur Herstellung des histor. Standpuncts* (1845), p. 48 sqq. Roberts, *Discussions on the Gospels*, Cambridge and London 1864, Macmillan & Co. (571, p. 8). Delitzsch, *Saat und Hoffnung*, 1874, p. 201 sqq.

under the Herodians and Romans; nay some even of the Asmoneans promoted Greek civilisation. The foreign rulers too brought with them into the country a certain amount of elements moulded by Greek training. We know of Herod especially, that he surrounded himself with Greek literati (see § 15). There were foreign troops in the land; Herod had even Thracian, German and Gallic mercenaries.²⁰⁸ The games given by Herod at Jerusalem brought not only foreign artists, but spectators from abroad into the holy city.²⁰⁹ But the most numerous concourse of strangers took place at the great annual Jewish festivals. The thousands of Jews, who came on these occasions from all parts of the world to Jerusalem, were for the most part both in language and education Hellenists. And not only Greek Jews, but actual Greeks, *i.e.* proselytes, came at the Jewish feasts to Jerusalem to sacrifice and worship in the temple (comp. John xii. 20 sqq.). We must conceive of the number of such proselytes, who made annual pilgrimages to Jerusalem, as something considerable. Again many Jews, who had received a Greek education abroad, took up their permanent abode at Jerusalem, and even formed there a synagogue of their own. Hence we find at Jerusalem in the times of the apostles a synagogue of the Libertines, Cyrenians, Alexandrians, Cilicians, and Asiatics (Acts vi. 9; comp. ix. 20), in which it is uncertain whether one congregation or five are spoken of.^{209a} In Galilee the larger towns had probably a fraction of Greek inhabitants. We know this for certain of Tiberias,²¹⁰ not to speak of the mainly non-Jewish Caesarea Philippi. Together with this strong penetration of the interior of Palestine by Greek elements, there must have been not infrequently the necessary acquaintance with the Greek tongue. And single traces actually point to

²⁰⁸ *Antt.* xvii. 8. 3.

²⁰⁹ *Antt.* xv. 8. 1.

^{209a} A synagogue of the Alexandrians at Jerusalem is also mentioned, *Tosefta Megilla* iii., ed. Zuckermann, pp. 224. 26; *Jer. Megilla* 73^d (in Lightfoot, *Horae* on Acts vi. 9).

²¹⁰ Joseph. *Vita*, 12.

this. For while the Asmoneans had their coins stamped with both Greek and Hebrew inscriptions, the Herodians and Romans coined even the money intended for the Jewish region proper with merely Greek inscriptions; and it is known from the gospel history that the (undoubtedly Greek) inscription upon the coins of Caesar could be read without difficulty at Jerusalem (Matt. xx. 20 sq.; Mark xii. 16; Luke xx. 24).²¹¹ The statement of the Mishna, that even in the temple certain vessels were marked with Greek letters, is certainly supported there by only one authority (R. Tomael), while according to the prevailing tradition the letters were Hebrew.²¹² When further it is determined in the Mishna that the writing of divorcement might be in the Greek language also,²¹³ and that the Holy Scriptures might be used in the Greek translation,²¹⁴ both these permissions may refer to the Jewish Dispersion beyond Palestine. The notice on the contrary, that at the time of the war of Titus (or more correctly Quietus) it was forbidden to any one to have his son instructed in Greek,²¹⁵ presupposes, that hitherto that which was now prohibited had taken place in the sphere of Rabbinic Judaism.^{215a} Nor can the circumstance be otherwise explained, than by a certain familiarity with Greek, that in the Mishna the names of Greek letters are often used for the explanation of certain figures, e.g. 'פ' for the explanation of the figure X, or טפא for the explanation of the figure T.²¹⁶

From the commencement of the Roman supremacy the *Latin* was added to the Greek language and culture. But Latin, as in all the eastern provinces, so also in Palestine, attained no wide diffusion till the later imperial period. In the first centuries the Roman officials in their intercourse with

²¹¹ Comp. the representation of such a denarius as Jesus probably had in His hand, in Madden's *History of Jewish Coinage*, p. 247.

²¹² *Shekalim* iii. 2.

²¹³ *Gittin* ix. 8.

²¹⁴ *Megilla* i. 8.

²¹⁵ *Sota* ix. 14.

^{215a} Comp. on the general position of Rabbinical Judaism to Greek education, Hamburger, *Real-Encycl.*, 2nd Div., art. "Griechenthum."

²¹⁶ 'פ', *Menachoth* vi. 3; *Kelim* xx. 7. טפא, *Middoth* iii. 1; *Kelim* xxviii. 7

provincials exclusively employed the Greek language. It was only in official documents, inscriptions, and the like, that Latin was, from the time of Caesar, also adopted. Thus *e.g.* Caesar commanded the Sidonians to set up in Sidon upon a brazen tablet his decree for the appointment of the Jewish high priest Hyrcanus II. in the Greek and Roman languages (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 2). Another official decree of the same period was in like manner to be set up in the Roman and Greek tongues in the temples of Sidon, Tyre, and Ascalon (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 3). Mark Antony commanded the Tyrians to set up in a public place a decree issued by him in Greek and Latin (*Antt.* xiv. 12. 5). In the temple at Jerusalem there were placed at intervals on the enclosure (*δρῦφακτος*), beyond which a nearer approach to the sanctuary was forbidden to Gentiles, tablets (*σπηλαι*) with inscriptions, which announced this prohibition partly in the Greek and partly in the Latin language (*Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 2, vi. 2. 4). The superscription also over the cross of Christ was written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin (*John* xix. 20). Beyond such official use Latin had not advanced in Palestine, in the early times of the Roman supremacy.

3. *Position of Judaism with respect to Heathenism.*

The more vigorously and perseveringly heathenism continued to penetrate into Palestine, the more energetically did legal Judaism feel called upon to oppose it. On the whole indeed the advance of heathen culture could not, as has been shown, be prevented. But for that very reason the lines of defence against all illegality were only the more strictly and carefully drawn by the vigilance of the scribes. Extreme vigilance in this direction was indeed a vital question for Judaism. For, if it was not to succumb in the struggle for existence, in which it was engaged, it must defend itself with the utmost energy against its adversary. But the anxiety with which the struggle was carried on infinitely increased

the danger which was to be guarded against, and which was in fact victoriously encountered. For the greater the subtilty with which casuistry determined the cases, which were to be regarded as a direct or indirect pollution through heathen customs, the more frequent was the danger of incurring it. Hence the course of events placed the pious Israelite in an all but unendurable position. He was in almost daily contact with heathenism, whether with persons or with goods and matters which sought and found entrance into Palestine in the way of trade and commerce. And the zeal of the scribes was continually increasing the number of snares, by which an Israelite who was a strict adherent to the law might incur uncleanness through heathen practices.

Two points especially were not to be lost sight of in guarding against heathen practices — (1) heathen idolatry and (2) heathen non-observance of the Levitical law of uncleanness. With respect to both the Pharisaism of the scribes proceeded with extreme minuteness. (1) For the sake of avoiding even an only apparent approximation to idolatry, the Mosaic prohibition of images (Ex. xx. 4 sq.; Deut. iv. 16 sq., xxvii. 15) was applied with the most relentless consistency.²¹⁷ To suffer anything rather than the setting up of the statue of Caligula in the temple was indeed quite right.²¹⁸ But pictorial representations in general, such as the trophies in the theatre in the time of Herod,²¹⁹ or the eagle at the gate of the temple,²²⁰ were also repudiated. When Pilate marched his troops into Jerusalem with the eagles of the legions, a regular tumult took place.²²¹ Vitellius took his troops by an indirect course from Antioch to Petra for the sole reason of not polluting the sacred soil of Judah by the Roman eagles.²²² And at the outbreak of the war, the first thing to be done in

²¹⁷ Comp. Winer, *RWB.*, art. "Bildnerei." Rüetschi, art. "Bilder," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 2nd ed. ii. 460 sqq. Wieseler, *Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evv.* p. 84 sqq.

²¹⁸ *Antt.* xviii. 8; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 10.

²¹⁹ *Antt.* xv. 8. 1, 2.

²²⁰ *Antt.* xvii. 6. 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 33. 2.

²²¹ *Antt.* xviii. 3. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 2, 3.

²²² *Antt.* xviii. 5. 3.

Tiberias was to destroy the palace of Antipas, because it was adorned with images of animals.²²³ It seems indeed, that coins with the image of the emperor were circulated in Judaea (Matt. xxii. 20, and parallel passages); but the coins issued there were not, from considerate forbearance, so stamped.²²⁴ When the famous scribe Gamaliel II. justified his visit to the baths of Aphrodite at Akko (Ptolemais) by saying, that the image of Aphrodite was there because of the baths, and not the baths because of the image of Aphrodite,²²⁵ this was a kind of consideration by no means generally recognised as valid in the sphere of legalistic Judaism. To obviate the danger of a direct or indirect encouragement of idolatry, or any kind of contact therewith, an Israelite was forbidden to transact business with Gentiles, to lend to, or borrow anything from them, to make them payments, or receive payments from them during the three days preceding, and, according to R. Ismael, also the three days following any heathen festival,²²⁶ while on the festival itself an Israelite was to hold no kind of intercourse in the town.²²⁷ All objects, which might even possibly be connected with idolatrous worship, were forbidden. Thus heathen wine must not only be made no use of, because it might possibly have been offered as a libation, but it was also forbidden to derive any profit from it.²²⁸ If wood had been taken from an idol grove all use of it was prohibited. If the stove had been heated by it, the stove must be broken to pieces, if it were still new; but if it were old, it must be let to cool. If bread had been baked with it, not only the eating, but every use of it was forbidden. If such bread were mixed with other bread, no use of it was allowed. If a weaver's

²²³ *Vita*, 12.

²²⁴ Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, v. 82 sq. Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage*, pp. 134–153. De Saulcy, *Numismatique de la Terre Sainte*, p. 69 sqq., pl. iii. and iv.

²²⁵ *Aboda sara* iii. 4.

²²⁶ *Aboda sara* i. 1, 2.

²²⁷ *Aboda sara* i. 4.

²²⁸ *Aboda sara* ii. 3; comp. also the Gemara (*Aboda Sara*, or the worship of idols, a tract from the Talmud, translated by Ferd. Christian Ewald, 2nd ed. 1868, p. 213 sqq., especially 221 sqq.).

shuttle were made of such wood, its use was forbidden. If a garment had been made of the stuff woven therewith, all use of the garment was forbidden. If this garment had been mixed among others, and these again among others, the use of all was forbidden.²²⁹

If all this sufficiently provided for the separation of Judaism from heathenism, it was still further inculcated by the notion, that a Gentile—as a non-observer of the laws of purification—was unclean, and that consequently all intercourse with him was defiling; that further, for the same reason, even the houses of the heathen, nay all objects touched by them,—so far as these were receptive of Levitical uncleanness,—were to be regarded as unclean.²³⁰ When it is said (Acts x. 28), that a Jew might have no intercourse with a heathen (ἀθέμιτόν ἐστιν ἀνδρὶ Ἰουδαίῳ κολλᾶσθαι ἢ προσέρχεσθαι ἀλλοφύλῳ), this must not indeed be misunderstood to the extent of supposing that there was an absolute prohibition of all intercourse, yet it does mean that ceremonial uncleanness was incurred by such intercourse. All Gentile houses were as such unclean.²³¹ Merely to enter them was to become unclean (John xviii. 28). All articles belonging to Gentiles and of a kind susceptible of Levitical uncleanness, were unclean, and needed before using some kind of purification. “If any one buys kitchen utensils of a Gentile, he must dip what is to be purified by dipping; boil what is to be boiled and heat in the fire what is to be heated; spits and gridirons are to be made red-hot; knives need only be sharpened and they are clean.”²³² Apart from this

²²⁹ *Aboda sara* iii. 9.

²³⁰ Comp. also on what follows, Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie* (1880), p. 68 sqq.

²³¹ *Ohaloth* xviii. 7. Comp. Kirchner, *Die jüdische Passahfeier und Jesu letztes Mahl* (Progr. of the Duisburg Gymnasium, 1870), pp. 34–41. Delitzsch, *Talmudische Studien*, xiv. The uncleanness of Gentile houses according to Jewish notions is testified to in the N. T. (*Zeitschr. für luth. Theol.* 1874, pp. 1–4). Schürer on *φαιγεῖν τὸ πάσχα*, John xviii. 28, *akademische Festschrift* (1883), p. 23 sq.

²³² *Aboda sara* v. 12.

uncleanness, which so many objects might contract by *use* on the part of Gentiles, there were lastly many heathen products, which could not be used by Jews, because in their production the Jewish laws, especially those relating to the distinction between clean and unclean, had not been observed. Partly for the former, partly for the latter reason, the most ordinary provisions, if coming from the heathen, were not to be eaten by Jews, who were only allowed to use them by buying and selling. This was especially the case with milk milked by a heathen without an Israelite seeing it, also with the bread and oil of the heathen.²³³ Neither could a strictly legal Israelite at any time sit at meat at a Gentile table (Acts xi. 3; Gal. ii. 12). Hence Israelites travelling in foreign countries were in very evil case, and, if they wanted to be exact in their observance of the law, had to restrict themselves to vegetable raw materials, as *e.g.* certain priests, friends of Josephus, who having been brought as prisoners to Rome lived there upon nuts and figs.²³⁴

To all the reasons here stated, which made intercourse with the heathen and their abode in the Holy Land a heavy burden to an Israelite, who was faithful to the law, was added an entirely opposite and doctrinal view, which caused the rule of strangers in the land of Israel to be felt as a glaring contrast between the ideal and reality. For the land was the property of the chosen people. None but Israelites could be landowners therein. Even the *letting* of houses and fields to the heathen was, according to the theory of the scribes, forbidden.²³⁵ And what with such views must have been their

²³³ *Aboda sara* ii. 6. With respect to oil, see Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 3. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 2; *Vita*, 13. On the motives, see the Gemara (*Aboda sara*, translated by Ewald, p. 247 sqq.). Milk *e.g.* was forbidden, because there might possibly be mixed with it milk from unclean animals; oil, because it might (at least according to one authority) have contracted uncleanness from unclean vessels. Talmudic authorities are not always clear even concerning the motives. See the discussions in the Gemara as above.

²³⁴ Joseph. *Vita*, 3.

²³⁵ *Aboda sara* i. 8. The letting of fields was still more strictly forbidden

feelings at finding the heathen really in possession—if not privately yet politically—of the whole land? Under such circumstances we can understand, that the question, whether it were lawful for a faithful Israelite to pay tribute to Caesar at all, would be one of serious consideration (Matt. xxii. 15–22; Mark xii. 13–17; Luke xx. 20–26).

Thus circumstances present us with a peculiar double picture: a yielding to the influence of heathen customs together with the erection of the strongest wall of partition against them. So far as the actual purpose of the latter was a defence against heathenism in its *religious* aspect, its aim was certainly attained. In other respects, however, heathen culture was not restrained by it, but only made a burdensome oppression to Israelites.

than that of houses, since in the former case not only was the possession of the soil delivered up to Gentiles, but tithe was not paid on the produce.

§ 23. CONSTITUTION. SANHEDRIM. HIGH PRIEST.

I. THE HELLENISTIC TOWNS

THE LITERATURE:

Noris, *Annus et epochae Syromacedonum in vetustis urbium Syriae nummis praesertim Mediceis expositae* (Florence 1689). I cite from the Leipsic edit. 1696.

Belley, *Suppléments aux Dissertations du Cardinal Noris sur les époques des Syro-Macédoniens*, in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, ancient series, vols. xxvi. xxviii. xxx. xxxii. xxxv. Paris 1759-1770.

Eckhel, *Doctrina numorum veterum*. Vol. iii. Vindob. 1794.

Mionnet, *Description de médailles antiques*. Vol. v. Paris 1811. *Supplement*. Vol. viii. Paris 1837. *Recueil des planches*. Paris 1808.

De Saulcy, *Numismatique de la Terre Sainte, Description des monnaies autonomes et impériales de la Palestine et de l'Arabie Pétrée*. Paris 1874.

Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*. 2nd ed. 3 parts in 6 half vols. Gotha 1877-1878.

Stark, *Gaza und die philistäische Küste*. Jena 1852.

Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerliche Verfassung des römischen Reichs bis auf die Zeiten Justinians*. 2 parts. Leipzig 1864-1865.

Kuhn, *Ueber die Entstehung der Städte der Alten. Komenverfassung und Synoikismos*. Leipzig 1878 (especially pp. 422-434).

Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*. Vol. i. (also under the title of *Handb. der röm. Alterthümer von Marquardt u. Mommsen*, vol. iv.). 2nd ed. Leipzig 1881.

Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft, unter den betr. Artikeln*.

Winer's and Schenkel's *Biblische Realwörterbücher, unter den betr. Artikeln*.

The geographical works of Reland, Raumer, Robinson, Ritter, Guérin, and others (for the titles see above, § 2).

Menke's *Bibelatlas*, maps iv. and v.

OF fundamental importance in the political life of Palestine during the Hellenic era was the independent organization of large municipal communities. This was indeed no novelty in Palestine, where from of old the large towns of the Philistine and Phoenician coasts had formed centres of political life. The entrance of Hellenism marks however a turning-

point in this respect also. For, on the one hand it essentially transformed the existing communities, while on the other it founded numerous new ones and made the municipal communities in general *the basis of the political organization of the country* in a far more thorough manner than before. Wherever Hellenism penetrated—especially on the Philistine coasts and the eastern boundaries of Palestine beyond the Jordan—the country districts were grouped around single large towns as their political centres. Each of such communities formed a comparatively independent whole managing its own internal affairs, and its dependence upon the rulers of Syria consisted only in the recognition of their military supremacy, the payment of taxes, and certain other performances. At the head of such a Hellenistically organized community was a democratic senate of several hundred members, which we may probably conceive of as resembling the Athenian *βουλή*, *i.e.* as one changed annually, chosen from the Phylae, or as a committee chosen by lot from the people (Marquardt).¹ It formed the ruling power, not for the town only, but also for all the smaller towns and villages, which belonged to the often extensive district of the town.² The entire Philistinian and Phoenician coast was in this way divided into a number of municipal communities, some of which were of considerable importance. We have then briefly to consider as such the Hellenistic towns in the east and north-east of Palestine, the Hellenized towns in the interior of Palestine, such as Samaria and Scythopolis, and the towns founded by Herod and his sons, of which a considerable portion of the population was non-Jewish.

¹ The Senate of Gaza, *e.g.* consisted of 500 members (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 13. 3), that of Tiberias of 600 (*BeK. Juá.* ii. 21. 9). Comp. Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerliche Verfassung*, ii. 354.

² The furnishing of these towns with a district of greater or less extent will be shown in many cases in what follows. Compare on the Hellenistic town-constitution, F. W. Tittmann, *Darstellung der griechischen Staatsverfassung*, Leipzig 1822. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. 208–216 (1881). Also much matter in the *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* p. 32 sqq.

With all their independence these towns of course participated on the whole in the political fate of the rest of Palestine. In the time of the Diadochoi the government changed very frequently. Ptolemy I. three times took possession of Phoenicia and Palestine, and three times had to surrender them. It was not till about 280 B.C. that Ptolemy (II.) Philadelphus succeeded in establishing the rule of the Ptolemies over these countries for a lengthened period.³ After that date not only Palestine proper, but also the whole of Phoenicia, as far as Eleutherus, south of Aradus, was under their dominion.⁴ Their power, however, did not extend beyond Lebanon. Damascus already belonged to the Seleucidae.⁵ In the years 219–217 B.C. Antiochus assumed a transitory possession of Palestine, but was obliged to give it up in consequence of the unsuccessful battle at Raphia. After the death of Ptolemy (IV.) Philopator, he however invaded Palestine a second time, and his victory at Panias (198 B.C.) was decisive in favour of the Seleucidae. From this time onward Palestine and the whole Philistinian-Phoenician coast belonged to the Syrian kingdom.⁶ The supremacy of the Ptolemies, like that of the Seleucidae, found its expression chiefly in two points: in the appointment of military governors (*στρατηγοί*) in the regions subject to their sway, and in the imposition of regular taxes. Josephus in his account of Josephus, the farmer of taxes, and his son Hyrcanus (*Antt.* xii. 4), gives us a very vivid picture of the manner in which the system of taxation was organized in the later period of their rule, a picture which, notwithstanding its

³ For particulars, see Stark, *Gaza und die philistäische Küste*, pp. 347–367. It seems probable, from an inscription of Oum el-Awamid, published by Renan (*Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 711–725), that Tyre had an era which began thirty-seven years later than that of the Seleucidae, i.e. 275 B.C. (see Renan as above, pp. 719–723). Its cause seems to have been the definite seizure of Phoenicia by Ptolemy II., who showed himself on that occasion the benefactor of the town. Comp. Six, *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1877, p. 192.

⁴ See Stark, pp. 368, 371. Kuhn, ii. 128 sq.

⁵ See below, on Damascus.

⁶ Farther particulars in Stark, pp. 375–406, 425 sqq.

fictitious colouring, certainly gives a faithful reflection of the institutions. It shows that the imposts were not collected by the authorities, but leased to great contractors, to whom their collection in the several towns was given up.⁷

Towards the end of the second century before Christ, the kingdom of the Seleucidae increasingly exhibits an image of dissolution. The central authority was so weakened by continual revolutions, that a multitude of independent communities were founded in the border lands of the empire. During this period therefore not only did the Jews obtain and maintain their full freedom, but a *number also of the larger towns*, which had already in the wars between Syria and Egypt often played a part of their own, declared themselves independent, and as a sign of their independence began a new computation of time. Thus Tyre had an era dating from the year 126 B.C.; Sidon a similar one from the year 111; Ascalon from 104. In other towns individual "Tyrants" would seize upon the sovereignty. Thus we find towards the end of the second, and in the beginning of the first century before Christ, a tyrant, Zeno Kotylas in Philadelphia, his son Theodorus in Amathus on the Jordan, Zoilus in Straton's Tower and Dora, Demetrius in Gamala.⁸ And there

⁷ In illustration of Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 4, compare especially Stark, pp. 412-423, and Nussbaum, *Observationes in Flavii Josephi Antiquitates* (Göttinger Dissertat. 1875), pp. 15-17. There is an internal contradiction in the narrative of Josephus. He transposes the beginning of the renting of the taxes by Josephus, which lasted twenty-two years to the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes, who died 221 B.C. (*Antt.* xii. 4. 1; comp. 4. 6); the entire account also assumes, that Palestine was then still under the rule of the Ptolemies. This would, as Stark states, p. 416, bring it to about the years 229-207 B.C. On the other hand however Josephus always calls the wife of the Egyptian king, Cleopatra, while this name was first naturalized in the family of the Ptolemies by Cleopatra, the daughter of Antiochus the Great and wife of Ptolemy V. Stark rightly finds the error to consist in the mistake as to the queen's name, and accepts the results which follow from the other dates. The view of Nussbaum is more artificial. It is based moreover upon the improbable assumption, that Palestine had shortly after the battle of Raphia already come again into the possession of Antiochus.

⁸ Stark, p. 478 sq. Kuhn, ii. 162.

is no lack of evidence that the Romans at their entry into Syria found there a number of independent petty princes.⁹

The strengthening of the Jewish power was in those times fatal for the towns in the neighbourhood of Palestine. Even the earlier Maccabees, and subsequently John Hyrcanus, subjected several towns. But it was especially Alexander Jannaeus who made conquests on a large scale. At the end of his rule all the coast towns from Raphia to Carmel, with the sole exception of Ascalon, almost all the towns of the country east of Jordan, and of course those also which were situated in the interior, such as Samaria and Scythopolis, as far north as the Lake of Merom,¹⁰ were subject to the Jews.

The conquest of Syria by Pompey put an end again at a stroke to the independence of all the small towns, which had separated themselves from the empire of the Seleucidae. The only consequence to the autonomic towns was, that they now entered into the same relations of voluntary dependence towards the Romans, in which they had hitherto stood towards the Seleucidae. To those towns however, which had been subjected by the Jews, the Roman invasion had even the character of a deliverance from a hated rule. For Pompey again separated from the Jewish region all those towns which had been subjected to the Jews since the time of the Maccabees and restored to them their freedom.¹¹ Josephus enumerates as such "liberated" towns, which had of course to acknowledge the Roman supremacy, the following: Gaza, Azotus, Jamnia, Joppa, Straton's Tower, Dora, Samaria, Scythopolis, Hippus, Gadara, Pella, Dium.¹² The list is, however, incomplete. For besides the above-named, others also

⁹ Josephus speaks quite generally of *μόναρχοι* (*Antt.* xiii. 16. 5). Appian. *Syr.* 50, testifies that Pompey *τῶν ὑπὸ τοῖς Σελευκίδαις γενομένων ἐθνῶν τοῖς μὲν ἐπέστειλεν οὐκείους βασιλείας ἢ δυνάστεας*, whom however Pompey certainly was not the first to create. Plinius, *Hist. Nat.* v. 23, 82, still knows in Syria of seventeen tetrarchias in *regna descriptas barbaris nominibus*.

¹⁰ Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 15. 4. See above, § 10.

¹¹ Compare on the Roman custom of giving their freedom to the towns of conquered regions, Kuhn, ii. 15-19.

¹² *Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 7.

used the Pompeian era, *i.e.* the computation since the liberation by Pompey, and many of these towns retained it till far into the imperial period. Those lying in the region east of the Jordan, together with Scythopolis, then united with each other in the "ten cities alliance," the so-called Decapolis. The proconsul Gabinius was another benefactor to many of these towns. In the years 57–55 B.C. he rebuilt the towns of Raphia, Gaza, Anthedon, Azotus, Jamnia, Apollonia, Dora, Samaria and Scythopolis, some of which had been entirely destroyed by the Jews.¹³ The Roman civil wars however, with their exhaustion of the provinces and the arbitrary rule of Antony in the East, brought bad times to these towns. He bestowed upon Cleopatra the entire Philistinian and Phoenician coast, from the borders of Egypt to Eleutherus, with the sole exception of Tyre and Sidon.¹⁴ Even when, after the fall of Antony and Cleopatra, whose authority had ceased of itself, a more quiet era had been established by Augustus, many of these towns again changed masters.¹⁵ Augustus bestowed upon Herod all the coast towns from Gaza to Straton's Tower, with the exception of Ascalon, together with the towns of Samaria, Hippus and Gadara in the interior.¹⁶ After the death of Herod these towns again experienced different fates. Gaza, Hippus and Gadara were placed under the immediate government of the Roman legate of Syria (on Anthedon, see below the section respecting it); Azotus and Jamnia with Phasaelis, which was built by Herod, were given to his sister Salome, while Joppa, Straton's Tower and Samaria fell with the rest of Judaea to Archelaus.¹⁷ The towns belonging to

¹³ *Antt.* xiv. 5. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 8. 4.

¹⁴ *Antt.* xv. 4. 1, *fn.*; *Bell. Jud.* i. 18. 5.

¹⁵ The different changes of possessors subsequently to Alexander Jannaeus are visibly represented by the numerous special maps in Menke's *Bibelatlas*, plates iv. and v.

¹⁶ *Antt.* xv. 7. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 20. 3. Of the coast towns Josephus names only Gaza, Anthedon, Joppa, and Straton's Tower. But Azotus and Jamnia, which after the death of Herod fell to his sister Salome, must then have come into Herod's possession.

¹⁷ *Antt.* xvii. 11. 4, 5; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 4.

Salome came after her death to the Empress Livia.¹⁸ After the death of Livia, they seem to have been transferred to the private possession of her son Tiberius, on which account we find an imperial ἐπίτροπος in his time in Jamnia.¹⁹ The towns bestowed upon Archelaus, together with the rest of his district, came after his deposition under the oversight of a Roman procurator, then in the years 41–44 A.D. to King Agrippa I., and were again after his death under Roman procurators. This frequent change of masters was however of little more consequence to these towns, than that the taxes had to be paid now to one now to another governor. For they had, on the whole, the independent management of their own affairs, even though the supremacy of their different masters made itself sometimes more and sometimes less noticed. Finally, it was of importance to the development of their communal life that Herod and his sons refounded a great number of towns, so especially Caesarea (= Straton's Tower), Sebaste (= Samaria), Antipatris, Phasaelis, Caesarea Philippi, Julias, Sepphoris, Livias, Tiberias.

The *kind of dependence* of these towns upon the Roman power both in name and in fact differed considerably.²⁰ There were in the Roman Empire both *free* and *subject* communities. The former (*civitates liberae*, ἐλεύθεροι) had not only their own judicature and administration of finance, but were also free from taxation proper and only bound to certain definitely appointed contributions; they were αὐτόνομοι καὶ φόρων ἀτελεῖς (Appian. *Civ.* i. 102).²¹ Again there was among these a privileged class, the *civitates foederatae* or such as had their freedom guaranteed by a *foedus*. All these free cities were indeed dependent upon Rome, but were not regarded as

¹⁸ *Antt.* xviii. 2. 2; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 1. Azotus is not expressly named but is certainly intended.

¹⁹ *Antt.* xviii. 6. 3. Comp. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, ii. 248 sq.

²⁰ Comp. on what follows, Kuhn, ii. 14–41. Marquardt, i. 71–86, 396. Also Stark, *Gaza*, pp. 522–525.

²¹ See especially Marquardt, i. 78 sq., 84 sq.

belonging in the strict sense to the province. From them must then be distinguished the subject towns (*ὑπήκοοι*) properly belonging to the province, the specific difference of which from the former consisted in their liability to taxation. For *αὐτονομία*, or the privilege *suvis legibus uti*, was often conceded to them, though under the control of the Roman proconsul.²² All the varieties of civic position here alluded to were represented among the Syrian towns. Tyre *e.g.* was one of the privileged *civitates foederatae*.²³ Ascalon was an *oppidum liberum*. But just because this is mentioned of Ascalon as something special, the *greater* number are *not* to be regarded as *free* communities in the technical sense of the word. Nor is it, according to what has just been said, opposed to this that many of them are designated as *αὐτόνομοι*. And still less does it signify, when Josephus says that Pompey made these towns free (*ἐλευθέρας*). For this means only their liberation from Jewish sway. Their political condition is correctly pointed out by Josephus by the expressions *προσένειμε τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ* and *κατέταξεν εἰς τὴν Συριακὴν ἐπαρχίαν*.²⁴ These slight political distinctions were not indeed of much practical importance. For the most privileged towns were taxed for certain requirements, and on the other hand many of the subject towns, at least in Syria, had a jurisdiction and administration of their own. Least of all were these distinctions paid respect to with regard to military affairs. It would be a great mistake to suppose, that in war all or most of these towns were released from the obligation of furnishing auxiliaries. At least Josephus speaks quite generally of the auxiliaries, which had been furnished by "the towns" at the campaign of Cestius Gallus against Jerusalem,²⁵ when in the year 4 B.C. Berytus with its district furnished

²² See especially Kuhn, ii. 34 sqq.

²³ Marquardt, i. 75.

²⁴ *Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 7.

²⁵ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 19: Πλεῖστοι δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν πόλεων ἐπικούροι συνέλεχσαν, ἡμπεριὰ μὲν ἡττάμενοι τῶν στρατιωτῶν, ταῖς δὲ προθυμίαις καὶ τῷ κατὰ Ἰουδαίων μίσῳ τὸ λείπον ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστήμασι ἀναπληροῦντες.

1500 auxiliaries to the army of Varus,²⁶ this certainly is not a case in point, inasmuch as Berytus was then already a Roman colony and was therefore under different legal regulations from the other towns. But we also know *e.g.* that from A.D. 44–67 there was in Caesarea a garrison of five cohorts and a wing of cavalry, which was formed for the most part of Caesareans and Sebastenians (inhabitants of the towns of Caesarea and Sebaste and their respective districts).²⁷ Nay we find towards the end of the first century after Christ a *cohors I. Tyrriorum* already in Moesia.²⁸ So too in occupying the towns with garrisons regard was certainly had less to political distinctions than to military requirements. “Free” Antioch became the chief seat of the Roman military force in Syria, and we know of Ascalon, that though an *oppidum liberum*, it received a Roman garrison, though but a small one.²⁹

The Roman colonies occupied among the towns of the Roman Empire a position of exemption from taxes.³⁰ There had been such both in Palestine and Phoenicia since the time of Augustus. The oldest were Berytus, founded by Augustus, Ptolemais by Claudius, Caesarea by Vespasian. All the colonies of the imperial period were military colonies, *i.e.* they consisted of superannuated soldiers, to whom possession of lands was awarded as payment for their services, and indeed in such wise, that this was always done to a large number at one place contemporaneously, thereby founding the colony. The lands required for the purpose were in earlier times simply taken from their possessors. Afterwards (*i.e.* after

²⁶ *Antt.* xvii. 10. 9; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 5. 1.

²⁷ *Antt.* xix. 9. 1, 2, xx. 6. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 12. 5, iii. 4. 2, and especially xx. 8. 7: μέγα δὲ φρονούντες ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦς πλείστοις τῶν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίους ἐκείσε στρατειομένων Καισαρεῖς εἶναι καὶ Σεβαστηνοῦς. Further particulars in the *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1875, p. 419 sqq.

²⁸ *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. iii. p. 863 (Diplom. xx. of the year A.D. 99).

²⁹ *Bell. Jud.* iii. 2. 1.

³⁰ See on this subject in general, Rein, art. “Colonia” in Pauly’s *Real-Enc.* ii. 504–517. Kuhn, *Die städt. und bürgerl. Verf.* i. 257 sqq. Marquardt, i. 35 sqq., 86 sqq., 92–132.

Augustus) it was customary to compensate the owners or to give the veterans such land as was already state property. The colonists either formed a new community beside the older one, or themselves entered into the older community, in which case the latter received in its entirety the Roman municipal constitution.³¹ Thus the plantation of a colony, which had formerly been an act of cruel plunder, gradually became an actual favour to a town. The rights of colonies also differed. Those were in the most favoured position, which had received the full *jus Italicum* and with it exemption from poll taxes and land taxes.³² Herod imitated Augustus in his system of establishing military colonies.³³

The position of those towns, which were temporarily under the *Herodian princes*, did not essentially differ from that of those directly under Roman governors. It is certainly possible, that the Herodian princes made their power more directly felt, but this cannot be proved. For the security of their sovereignty, they appointed governors of their own in the towns; thus Herod the Great placed an ἄρχων in Idumaea and Gaza,³⁴ Agrippa I. a στρατηγός in Caesarea³⁵ and an ἑπαρχος in Tiberias,³⁶ Agrippa II. a viceroy in Caesarea Philippi³⁷ and an ἑπαρχος in Gamala.³⁸ Such a viceroy was also the ἐθνάρχης of King Aretas in Damascus, 2 Cor. xi. 32.

The great independence of these towns involves the fact, that *each had its special history*. In following this in each separate case, we shall begin with the towns of the Philistinian and Phoenician coast, advancing from south to north. Many of these had at the commencement of the Hellenistic period a brilliant past behind them and continued to be of prominent importance during the whole Graeco-Roman period.

1. *Raphia*, *Παφία* (so is it written on the coin), may still be

³¹ Marquardt, i. 118 sq.

³² Marquardt, i. 89.

³³ *Antt.* xv. 8. 5. See below, Samaria, Geba, Heshbon.

³⁴ *Antt.* xv. 7. 9.

³⁵ *Antt.* xix. 7. 4.

³⁶ Joseph. *Vita*, 9; whether Agrippa I. or II. is spoken of is uncertain.

³⁷ *Vita*, 13. Comp. Kuhn, ii. 346.

³⁸ *Vita*, 11.

pointed out in the ruins of *Kirbeth bir Refah*, situated according to Guérin about half a league from the sea, but upon a flat harbourless shore,³⁹ and therefore regarded by Pliny and Ptolemy as an inland town.⁴⁰ It was the first Syrian town after leaving Egypt.⁴¹ Apart from the cuneiform inscriptions,⁴² it is first mentioned in history in the campaign of Antigonos against Egypt, B.C. 306, when the fleet of Antigonos, under the command of his son Demetrius, was here destroyed by a storm.⁴³ It then became famous chiefly through the victory, which was here gained by the unwarlike Ptolemy Philopater over Antiochus the Great, and which resulted in the loss of Palestine and Phoenicia by the latter.⁴⁴ In the year 193 the marriage of Ptolemy Philopater with Cleopatra, daughter of Antiochus the Great, was celebrated here.^{44a} In the beginning of the first century before Christ Raphia was conquered by Alexander Jannaeus (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 13. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 4. 2; comp. *Antt.* xiii. 15. 4), was afterwards, like the neighbouring towns, separated by Pompey from the Jewish district and was rebuilt by Gabinius (*Antt.* xiv. 5. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 8. 4). Hence the coins of Raphia, of the imperial age (from Commodus to Philip the Arabian), have an era commencing with the refoundation by Gabinius (57 B.C.).⁴⁵

³⁹ Diodor. xx. 74 calls Raphia *δυσπροσόρμιστον καὶ τευαγώδη*.

⁴⁰ Plin. *Hist. Nat.* v. 13. 68. Ptolem. (ed. Nobbe), v. 16. 6. Comp. also, Strabo, xvi. 2. 31; *Itinerar. Antonini* (ed. Parthey et Pinder, 1848), p. 69. Sozomenus, *Hist. eccl.* vii. 15. Hierocles, *Synecdemus* (ed. Parthey, 1866), p. 44. Reland, *Palaestina*, p. 967 sq. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xiv. 138 sqq., xvi. 39. Raumer, *Palästina*, p. 219. Guérin, *Judée*, ii. 233–235. Le Quien, *Oriens christianus*, iii. 630.

⁴¹ Polyb. v. 80: Πρώτη τῶν κατὰ Κοίλην Συρίαν πόλεων ὡς πρὸς τὴν Αἰγυπτὸν. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 11. 5: ἔστι δὲ ἡ πόλις αὕτη Συρίας ἀρχή.

⁴² Friedr. Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?* (1881), p. 291.

⁴³ Diodor. xx. 74. Droysen, *Gesch. des Hellenismus* (2nd ed.), ii. 2. 147. Stark, *Gaza*, p. 358.

⁴⁴ The battle is fully described Polyb. v. 82–86. Comp. Stark, *Gaza*, p. 382–386.

^{44a} Livius, xxxv. 18.

⁴⁵ This may now be considered as certain, though Noris and Eckhel still hesitate, whether the era of Pompey or of Gabinius was to be accepted. See Noris, *Annus et epochae Syromacedonum*, v. 4. 2 (ed. Lips. p.

It seems hence to have been in the possession of the Herodian princes.

2. *Gaza*, Γάζα, Hebr. גֶּזַי,⁴⁶ the ancient and important city of the Philistines, so often mentioned in the Old Testament.⁴⁷ Herodotus knows it by the name of *Kádutyis*, and remarks, that it is not much smaller than Sardis.^{47a} Already in the times of Persian supremacy it must—as the coins testify—have been in active intercourse with Greece.^{47b} In the time of Alexander the Great it was next to Tyre the most important fortress on the Philistinian-Phoenician coast. Alexander did not take it till after a three months' troublesome siege (332 B.C.).⁴⁸ After that time it became more and more a Greek

515–521). Eckhel, *Doctrina numorum*, iii. 454 sq. Mionnet, *Description de médailles*, v. 551 sq.; *Suppl.* viii. 376 sq.; Kenner, *Die Münzsammlung des Stifts St. Florian in Ober-Oesterreich* (1871), pp. 179–182, Plate vi. n. 17–18. De Sauley, *Numismatique de la Terre Sainte*, pp. 237–240, pl. xii. n. 7–9. Stark, *Gaza*, p. 515.

⁴⁶ On the Hebrew form, comp. Steph. Byz. s.v. Γάζα· ἐκλήθη καὶ Ἀζα· καὶ μέχρι νῦν Σύροι Ἀζαν αὐτὴν καλοῦσιν.

⁴⁷ See Reland, *Palaestina*, pp. 787–800. Robinson's *Palestine*, ii. pp. 36–43. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xvi. 45–65. Raumer, *Palästina*, pp. 192–194. Winer, *RWB.* s.v. Arnold in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. iv. 671–674. Sepp, *Jerusalem und das heilige Land*, 2nd ed. ii. 617 sqq. Guérin, *Judée*, ii. 178–211, 219–221. *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, iii. 234 sq., 248–251, and pl. xix. of the large English chart. Gatt, *Bemerkungen über Gaza und seine Umgebung* (*Zeitschr. des deutschen Pal. Ver.* vii. 1–14). For the history, see especially Stark, *Gaza*. Also Alb. v. Hormann, *Gaza, Stadt, Umgebung und Geschichte*, 1876 (*Progr. des Knabenseminars der Diöcese Brixen zu Rothholz*, see the notice in *Zeitschr. f. die österreich. Gymnasien*, 1877, p. 142 sq.).

^{47a} Herodot. ii. 159, iii. 5: Σαρδίῳ οὐ κολλᾷ ἐλάσσονος.

^{47b} Comp. on these exceedingly interesting coins the learned article of Six, *Observations sur les monnaies phéniciennes* (*Numismatic Chronicle*, new series, vol. xvii. 1877, pp. 177–241; on Gaza, pp. 221–239). The coins have partly Greek, partly Phoenician inscriptions. The name of the town (γζ or γζγ) is to be seen at all events on several of them. Their most interesting feature however is, that they are coined according to an Athenian standard and with Athenian types, evidently for commerce with Greece. It is probable, that genuine Athenian coins first came to Palestine in the period of the hegemony of Athens in the fifth century before Christ, and that henceforth others were coined after their pattern. See Six, as above, pp. 230 sq., 234–236.

⁴⁸ The two months' duration of this siege is testified by Diodor. xvii. 48 and Josephus, *Antt.* xi. 8. 3, 4. Comp. also Arrian, ii. 26, 27. Curtius, iv. 6,

town.⁴⁹ The contests of Ptolemy Lagos with the other Diadochoi for the possession of Coelesyria of course affected Gaza in the highest degree. In 315 B.C. it was conquered by Antigonus.⁵⁰ In 312 it again fell into the hands of Ptolemy in consequence of his victory gained at Gaza over Demetrius the son of Antigonus.⁵¹ In the same year however he renounced the possession of Coelesyria, and on his retreat had the most important fortresses, Gaza among them, demolished.⁵² The sovereignty over these districts changed several times during the decades next following, till at length they were for a longer period in the possession of the Ptolemies about 240 B.C. In the years 218--217 Gaza, like the rest of Syria, was temporarily in the possession of Antiochus the Great.⁵³ Twenty years later Coelesyria came permanently under the dominion of the Seleucidae through the victory of Antiochus the Great at Panias (198 B.C.). Gaza also must then have been conquered after a difficult siege, to which indeed we have only allusions in Polybius.⁵⁴ The sway of the Seleucidae is evidenced among other things by a coin of Demetrius I. (Soter) minted at Gaza.⁵⁵ During the contests in the Syrian kingdom between Demetrius II. (Nicator) and Antiochus VI. respecting Trypho (145--143 B.C.), Gaza refusing to join the party of Antiochus, was besieged by

and Plutarch. *Alexander*, 25. Polyb. xvi. 40 (= ed. Hultsch, xvi. 22^a). Droysen, *Gesch. d. Hellenismus*, 2nd ed. i. 1, 297-301. Stark, *Gaza*, pp. 236-244.

⁴⁹ It is expressly designated a πόλις Ἑλληνίς, Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 11. 4; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 3.

⁵⁰ Diodor. xix. 59. Droysen, ii. 2. 11. Stark, p. 350.

⁵¹ Diodor. xix. 84. On the battle, Droysen, ii. 2. 42 sqq. Stark, pp. 351-354.

⁵² Diodor. xix. 93: κατέσκαψε τὰς ἀξιολογωτάτας τῶν κεκρατημένων πόλεων, Ἀχην μὲν τῆς Φοινίκης Συρίας, Ἰόπην δὲ καὶ Σαμάρειαν καὶ Γάζαν τῆς Συρίας. Comp. Stark, p. 355 sq.

⁵³ Polyb. v. 80. Stark, pp. 382-385.

⁵⁴ Polyb. xvi. 18, xvi. 40 (ed. Hultsch, xvi. 22^a), xxix. 6^a (ed. Hultsch, xxix. 12). Stark, p. 204 sq.

⁵⁵ Gardner, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum, Seleucid kings of Syria* (1878), p. 47.

Jonathan the Maccabee in concert with him, and its environs laid waste, whereupon it gave up its opposition and delivered hostages to Jonathan as a pledge of its adherence to Antiochus.⁵⁶ With respect to the constitution of Gaza at this time we learn incidentally, that it had a council of 500 members.⁵⁷ About the year 96 B.C. Gaza as well as the neighbouring cities of Raphia and Anthedon fell into the hands of Alexander Jannaeus. Alexander conquered it after a siege of one year, though at last only through treachery, and abandoned the city and its inhabitants to destruction (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 13. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 4. 2; comp. *Antt.* xiii. 15. 4. Stark, p. 499 sqq.). When Pompey conquered Syria, Gaza also—so far as its existence can be then spoken of—obtained its freedom (*Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 7). The newly built town consequently began a new era from the time of Pompey (52 B.C.).⁵⁸ The rebuilding itself did not take place till the time of Gabinius (*Antt.* xv. 5. 3). Probably the ancient Gaza was then forsaken and the new town built somewhat farther southwards.⁵⁹ In the year 30 B.C. Gaza

⁵⁶ 1 Macc. xi. 61, 62. Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 5. 5. Stark, p. 492. No conquest of Gaza took place in the Maccabean period. For in the passage 1 Macc. xiii. 43–48 we must read Gazara.

⁵⁷ Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 13. 3.

⁵⁸ On the era of Gaza, comp. Noris, *Annus et epochae Syromaced.* v. 2, 3 (ed. Lips. pp. 476–502). Eckhel, *Doct. Num.* iii. 448–454. Ideler, *Handb. der Chronol.* i. 474 sq. Stark, *Gaza*, pp. 513–515. The coins in Mionnet, v. 535–549; *Suppl.* viii. 371–375. De Saulcy, *Numismatique de la Terre Sainte*, pp. 209–233, pl. xi. The *Chronicon paschale* (ed. Dindorf, i. 352) remarks on Olymp. 179. 4 = 61 B.C.: 'Εντεῦθεν Γαζαῖοι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν χρόνους ἀριθμοῦσιν. Hence Noris and Eckhel place the beginning of the era in the year 61 B.C. According however to Ideler and Stark, the year 62 must according to the coins be regarded as the starting-point of the era.

⁵⁹ On the distinction between Old and New Gaza, comp. especially Stark, pp. 352 sq., 509–513. The town near which Ptolemy Lagos conquered Demetrius Poliorcetes, 312 B.C., is expressly called *Old Gaza* by Diodorus and Porphyry; see Diodor. xix. 80 (τὴν παλαιάν Γάζαν); Porphyry in the fragment in Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene, i. col. 249–250 (according to the Armenian *veterem Gazam*, in Greek in Syncellus, Παλαιάγαν, or as Gutschmid reads Παλαιγάζην). It is to just this Old Gaza that the notice of Strabo, that Gaza was destroyed by Alexander and has since lain waste, refers; Strabo, xvi. 2. 30, p. 759: κατασπασμένη δ' ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ μένουσα

came under the authority of Herod the Great (*Antt.* xv. 7. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 20. 3). After his death it was again added to the province of Syria (*Antt.* xvii. 11. 4; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 3). With this agrees the fact, that the imperial coins of Gaza do not begin till after the death of Herod the Great. The oldest known are two coins of Augustus of the years 63 and 66 aer. Gaz.⁶⁰ In the time of Claudius, Gaza is spoken of as an important city by the geographer Mela.⁶¹ In A.D. 66 it was attacked and destroyed by the rebellious Jews (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1). This must however have been a very partial destruction. For so strong a fortress could not have been actually destroyed by a band of insurrectionary

ἔρημος. [The remark in Acts viii. 26: αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος, is on the contrary not in point here, because αὕτη there more probably refers to ὁδός.] Strabo is indeed so far mistaken, that he seems to know nothing of New Gaza, his remark being based upon the statement of an older geographer, in whose time New Gaza did not as yet exist. The existence of a New Gaza, somewhat to the south of Old Gaza, is however chiefly evidenced by an anonymous geographical fragment (Αποσπασματὶα τινὰ γεωγραφικὰ, ed. Hudson [in the appendix to his edition of Dionysius Perieget., *Geographiæ vet. scriptores Graeci minores*, vol. iv., Oxon. 1717], p. 39: μετὰ τὰ Ῥινοκόρουρα ἡ νέα Γάζα κεῖται πόλις οὕσα καὶ αὐτὴ εἶθ' ἡ ἔρημος Γάζα, εἴτα ἡ Ἀσκάλων πόλις) and by Hieronymus (*Onomast.*, ed. Lagarde, p. 125: antiquae civitatis locum vix fundamentorum praebere vestigia, hanc autem quae nunc cernitur, in alio loco pro illa, quae conruit, aedificatam). If then the local distinction of Old and New Gaza is beyond question, we must also with Stark consider it most probable, that the foundation of New Gaza must be referred to Gabinius. For an entire destruction of Old Gaza did not, as Strabo seems to suppose, result from its conquest by Alexander the Great, but from that by Alexander Jannaeus. For the rest both Old and New Gaza lay twenty stadia inland (see on Old Gaza, Arrian, II. 26; on New Gaza, Sozom. *Hist. eccl.* v. 3; Strabo, p. 759, erroneously seven stadia, Antoninus Martyr, c. 33, mil. pass.). From both too must be distinguished the port of Gaza, which indeed remained the same for both, Γαζαίων λιμὴν, Strabo, p. 759; Ptolemaeus, v. 16. 2. This port was raised to a city under the name of Κωνσταντία by Constantine the Great (Euseb. *Vita Constantin.* iv. 38; Sozomenus, *Hist. eccl.* ii. 5), but lost this name again together with the rights of a city through Julian and was afterwards called again only Μαῖουμᾶς (= seaport town); see Sozom. *Hist. eccl.* v. 3. *Marci Diaconi Vita Porphyrii*, ed. Haupt (an article of the Berlin Acad. 1874), c. 57. Antoninus Martyr, c. 33. Reland, p. 791 sqq. Stark, p. 513. Kuhn, ii. 363. Guérin, *Judée*, ii. 219-221.

⁶⁰ Eckhel, iii. 453 sq. Mionnet, v. 536. De Sauley, p. 213.

⁶¹ Mela, i. 11: in Palaestina est ingens et munita admodum Gaza.

Jews. Coins too of the years 130, 132, 135 aer. Gaza. (= A.D. 68/69, 70/71, 73/74) testify to the lasting prosperity of the city.⁶² Special tokens of favour seem to have been bestowed upon it by Hadrian.⁶³ It is called on an inscription of the time of Gordian (A.D. 238–244) *ἱερὰ καὶ ἄσυλος καὶ αὐτόνομος*.⁶⁴ It must have subsequently become a Roman colony.⁶⁵ Eusebius speaks of it as a *πόλις ἐπίσημος*.⁶⁶ And this too it remained for a considerable period.⁶⁷ The independence of these great cities is shown in perhaps the most striking manner by the fact, that Gaza as well as Ascalon, Tyre and Sidon had each its own calendar.⁶⁸

3. *Anthedon*, Ἀνθηδών, situate on the sea, erroneously called an inland town by Pliny,⁶⁹ was according to Sozomen only twenty stadia from Gaza, probably in a northerly (north-westerly) direction.^{69a} Its very name shows it to have been

⁶² Mionnet, v. 537 sq.; *Suppl.* viii. 372. De Saulcy, p. 214.

⁶³ The coins of Hadrian's time have a new Hadrianic era as well as the usual town era. The *Chronicon paschale* (ed. Dindorf, i. 474) mentions besides a *πανήγυρις Ἀδριανή*, as celebrated since the time of Hadrian. See Stark, p. 550.

⁶⁴ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 5892. Comp. Stark, p. 554 sq.

⁶⁵ Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscriptions*, vol. iii. n. 1904: *Κολωνίας Γάζης*. The mention also of a *Gazensis Duumvir* by Jerome, *Vita Hilarionis*, c. 20 (Vallarsi, ii. 22), points to a Roman municipal constitution. Comp. Marquardt, *Rom. Staatsverwaltung*, i. 429.

⁶⁶ Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lagarde, p. 242.

⁶⁷ Antoninus Martyr (about A.D. 570, *De locis sanctis*, c. 33; Tobler et Molinier, *Itinera*, i. 109): Gaza autem civitas est splendida, deliciosa, homines in ea honestissimi, omni liberalitate decori, amatores peregrinorum.

⁶⁸ See on the whole, Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie*, i. 410 sq., 434 sq., 438 sq. On Gaza also, Noris, v. 2 (ed. Lips. p. 476 sqq.). Stark, p. 517 sq.

⁶⁹ Plin. *Hist. Nat.* v. 13. 68: intus Anthedon. That it was on the coast is however certain from the unanimous testimony of all other authors; see Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 15. 4, xviii. 6. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 8; Ptolem. v. 16. 2; Steph. Byz. s.v.; Sozomenus, *Hist. eccl.* v. 9. See on the subject in general, Reland, *Palaestina*, pp. 566–568. Raumer, *Palästina*, p. 171. Pauly's *Real-Encycl.* i. 1. 1087 sq. Guérin, *Judée*, ii. 215–218. Le Quien, *Oriens christianus*, iii. 631.

^{69a} Sozomenus, v. 9. Anthedon is according to Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 15. 4 generally placed south of Gaza. But the majority of the passages from Josephus speak of it as north of Gaza (*Antt.* xv. 7. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 4. 2, 20

founded in the Greek period. It is first mentioned in the time of Alexander Jannaeus, who conquered it about the same time as Raphia (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 13. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 4. 2; comp. *Antt.* xiii. 15. 4). Like the other coast towns it was undoubtedly retaken from the Jews by Pompey. Gabinius rebuilt it (*Antt.* xiv. 5. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 8. 4). Augustus bestowed it on Herod (*Antt.* xv. 7. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 20. 3), who again restored it and gave it the name of Agrippias or Agrippeion in honour of Agrippa (*Antt.* xiii. 13. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 4. 2, 21. 8). It is not expressly mentioned in the partition of Herod's inheritance. Hence it is uncertain whether, like its neighbour Gaza, it was united to the province of Syria, or passed like Joppa and Caesarea to Archelaus (see Stark, p. 542 sq.). In the latter case it would have shared the fate of the rest of Judaea and therefore have come, after the deposition of Archelaus, under Roman procurators and have been from A.D. 41–44 under the rule of King Agrippa. The existence of a coin of Anthedon with the name of Agrippa would give evidence of the latter, if its reading were certain.⁷⁰ At the beginning of the Jewish war Anthedon was attacked and partially devastated by the revolted Jews (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1). The name Agrippias was never naturalized; Josephus already and all subsequent authors call it Anthedon again.⁷¹ On coins too only this name occurs.⁷²

3, ii. 18. 1); so too Plinius, v. 13. 68. The note of Theodosius is decisive for its lying *between Gaza and Ascalon*; Theodosius, *De situ terrae sanctae* (ed. Gildemeister, 1882), § 18: inter Ascalonam et Gazam civitates duae, id est Anthedon et Maioma. Rightly therefore has Gatt (*Zeitschr. des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, vii. 1884, pp. 5–7) identified the ruins of el-Blachije, one league north-west of Gaza, for which a native gave him the name of Teda, with Anthedon. Comp. also the remarks of Nöldeke and Gildemeister, *Zeitschr. d. DPV.* vii. 140–142.

⁷⁰ The coins in Mionnet, *Suppl.* viii. 364. Against the correctness of the reading see Madden, *Coins of the Jews* (1881), p. 134.

⁷¹ So Plinius, Ptolemaeus, Steph. Byz., Sozomenus in the passages cited; Hierocles, *Synecd.* p. 44; the Acts of the Councils in Le Quien, as above. The isolated assertion of Tzetzes (in Reland, p. 567), that the former Anthedon is “now” called Agrippias, is based upon Josephus only.

⁷² Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* iii. 443 sq. Mionnet, *Descript.* v. 522 sq.; *Suppl.*

4. *Ascalon*, Ἀσκάλον, Hebr. אַשְׁדּוֹן, was like Gaza an important town of the Philistines, repeatedly mentioned in the Old Testament and also already known to Herodotus.⁷³ The present Ascalon lies close to the sea, and Ptolemy also mentions Ascalon as a coast town.⁷⁴ But the old town must have lain inland, if ever so little, since even in the sixth century after Christ Ascalon and Majuma Ascalonis are distinguished.⁷⁵ In the Persian period Ascalon belonged to the Tyrians.⁷⁶ Coins of Alexander the Great coined at Ascalon mark the commencement of the Hellenistic period.^{76a} Like all Palestine and Phoenicia it was in the third century before Christ under the dominion of the Ptolemies, and had consequently to pay them yearly tribute.⁷⁷ With Antiochus III. began its subjec-

viii. 364. De Sauley, *Numismatique de la Terre Sainte*, pp. 234–236, pl. xii. n. 1–4. All three indeed give also coins with the legend Ἀγριππίων. But these do not belong to Anthedon; see Stark, p. 515.

⁷³ Herodot. i. 105. See on Ascalon in general, Reland, *Palaestina*, pp. 586–596. Winer, *RWB.*, and Pauly, *Real-Enc. s.v.* Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xvi. 70–89. Raumer, *Paläst.* p. 173 sq. Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung nach Palästina* (1859), pp. 32–44. Sepp, *Jerusalem* (2nd ed.), ii. 599 sqq. Guérin, *Judée*, ii. 135–149, 153–171. Guthe, *Die Ruinen Askalon's*, with a plan (*Zeitschr. d. deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, ii. 164 sqq.). *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, iii. 237–247 (with a plan), also plate xix. of the large English chart.

⁷⁴ Ptolem. v. 16. 2.

⁷⁵ Antoninus Martyr, c. 33 (in Tobler and Molinier, *Itinera*, i. 109): Ascalonem . . . In proximo civitatis Maiuma Ascalonis. In A.D. 518 a bishop of Ascalon and a bishop of Majuma Ascalonis are mentioned contemporaneously; see Le Quien, *Oriens christ.* iii. 602 sq. Kuhn, ii. 363.

⁷⁶ Scylax in *Geographi graeci minores*, ed. Müller, i. 79: Ἀσκάλων πόλις Τυρίων καὶ βασιλεία. Movers (*Phönicier*, ii. 2. 177 sq.) insists on referring this notice only to the harbour of Ascalon (Majuma Ascalonis) which he considers to be a foundation of the Tyrians. But this lay in the immediate neighbourhood of the town (see the preceding note) and could hardly have been in the possession of any, who did not own the town itself. It is on the contrary to be supposed, that Ascalon was, in the Persian period (to which the statements of Scylax refer) under the rule of the Tyrians as Joppa and Dora were under that of the Sidonians.

^{76a} L. Müller, *Numismatique d'Alexandre le Grand* (1855), p. 308, planches, n. 1472 sqq. The coins communicated by Mionnet, i. 522, *Suppl.* iii. 199, belong, according to Müller, p. 267, to the town of Aspendos in Pamphylia.

⁷⁷ Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 4. 5; see above, p. 52 sq. If it is correct, that a coin of Antiochus, coined at Ascalon, is in existence (as Mionnet, v. 8, No. 59,

tion to the Seleucidae, which is also evidenced by Ascalonian Seleucid coins from Antiochus III. to Antiochus IX.⁷⁸ Ascalon was able by prudent concessions to protect itself against the increasing power of the Jews. The Maccabaeen Jonathan did indeed march twice against the town, but was on both occasions pacified by a respectful welcome on the part of the inhabitants.⁷⁹ Ascalon was also the only coast town, which remained unmolested by Alexander Jannaeus. It was able in the year 104 B.C. to attain to independence and thenceforth began a computation of time of its own, which it made use of even in the times of the Roman Empire.⁸⁰ The Romans acknowledged its independence at least formally.⁸¹ Besides the usual era of the year 104 B.C. another of 57 B.C. occurs in several instances, which proves that Ascalon was favoured by Gabinius.⁸² On some of the coins of Ascalon the heads have been taken for

states), Ascalon must at that time have been under Syrian sway. But comp. on the other side, Stark, *Gaza*, p. 476; Droysen, iii. 1. 274.

⁷⁸ Mionnet describes Ascalonian coins of Antiochus III. and IV., of Trypho and Antiochus VIII. (*Descript. de médailles*, v. p. 25, No. 219, pp. 38, 72, No. 625, p. 525; *Suppl.* viii. 366). The catalogue of the British Museum gives such of Trypho, Alexander Zebinas, Antiochus VIII. and IX. (Gardner, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins, Seleucid Kings*, 1878, pp. 68, 69, 81–88, 91); de Saulcy, one of Trypho (*Mélanges de Numismatique*, vol. ii. 1877, p. 82 sq.). See on the subject generally, Stark, *Gaza*, pp. 474–477.

⁷⁹ 1 Macc. x. 86 and xi. 60. Stark, *Gaza*, pp. 490 sq., 492.

⁸⁰ See on the era 104 B.C., *Chron. paschale* on Olymp. 169. 1=104 B.C. (ed. Dindorf, i. 346): 'Ἀσκαλωνῖται τοὺς ἑαυτῶν χρόνους ἐντεύθεν ἀριθμοῦσιν. Hieron. *Chron. ad ann. Abrah.* 2295 (in Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene, ii. 185): The second year of Probus (1030 A.V.C.)=380 aer. Ascal. Noris, *Annus et epochae*, v. 4. 1 (ed. Lips. pp. 503–515). Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* iii. 444–447. Coins in Mionnet, *Descr.* v. 523–533; *Suppl.* viii. 365–370. De Saulcy, *Numismatique de la Terre Sainte*, pp. 178–208, 406, pl. ix. x. The same, *Mélanges de Numismatique*, vol. ii. 1877, pp. 148–152.

⁸¹ Plinius, *Hist. Nat.* v. 13. 68: oppidum Ascalo liberum. In the earlier imperial period (down to the middle of the 2nd century after Christ) Ascalon used autonomic as well as imperial coins, the former however of only the smallest kind and least value; see de Saulcy, p. 187.

⁸² The double date 56 and 102 is found on a coin of Augustus. On another (in de Saulcy, p. 189, No. 8), 55 and 102. The year 102 is according to the usual era of Ascalon 3/2 B.C. If however this, according to the second era=55/56, then the year 1 of this latter era=57 B.C. (not 58, as was before supposed on the strength of the coin of the year 56).

those of Cleopatra and a Ptolemy, which would point to their sovereignty or claims to sovereignty over this region.^{82a} Ascalon was never in the possession of Herod and his successors, although it was indeed adorned with public buildings by Herod,⁸³ who seems also to have had a palace there, which after his death passed into the possession of his sister Salome.⁸⁴ The ancient enmity of the Jews and Ascalonians made the breaking out of the Jewish war in A.D. 66 fatal for both. At first Ascalon was devastated by the Jews;⁸⁵ then the Ascalonians put to death all the Jews dwelling in their city, 1500 in number;⁸⁶ finally, the Jews made a second attack upon the town, which was indeed easily repelled by the Roman garrison stationed there.⁸⁷ Ascalon long remained a flourishing Hellenistic city with celebrated religious rites and games.⁸⁸ Many individuals famous in Greek literature were natives of this town.⁸⁹

5. *Azotus*, "Ἀζωτος, or Ashdod, Hebr. אֲשְׁדּוֹד, like Gaza and Ascalon, an old Philistine town frequently mentioned in the Old

^{82a} De Saulcy, *Note sur quelques monnaies inédites d'Ascalon* (*Revue Numismatique*, 1874, pp. 124-135). Feuardent, the same, pp. 184-194. Comp. Bursian's *philol. Jahresbericht*, vii. 467 sq.

⁸³ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 11.

⁸⁴ Joseph. *Ant.* xvii. 11. 5; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 3. Comp. Stark, p. 542. On the question, whether Herod was born at Ascalon, see above, § 12. De Saulcy thinks the use of certain supposed Jewish symbols (two cornucopias crossing each other with a lemon (?) in the middle) upon certain coins of Ascalon of the time of Augustus must be referred to the influence of Herod; see his *Note sur quelques monnaies d'Ascalon*, in the *Annuaire de la Société Française de Numismatique et d'Archéologie*, iii. 253-258.

⁸⁵ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1.

⁸⁶ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 5.

⁸⁷ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iii. 2. 1, 2. On the enmity of the Ascalonians to the Jews, see also Philo, ii. 576, ed. Mangey.

⁸⁸ The games are mentioned in the inscription *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4472; Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscriptions*, vol. iii. n. 1839 (comp. above, p. 24 sq.). Ammian. Marcellin. xiv. 8. 11 mentions Caesarea, Eleutheropoli, Neapolis, Ascalon and Gaza as the most important towns of Palestine. To this very day "the ruins of Ascalon and Kaisarieh are the most considerable on the whole coast from Ghâseh to Bêrût" (Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung*, p. 44).

⁸⁹ Steph. Byz. s.v. reckons four philosophers, two grammarians, and two historians of Ascalon (comp. above, p. 25); and the catalogue is not yet complete (see Reland, p. 594).

Testament and already known to Herodotus.⁹⁰ Ptolemy speaks of it as a coast town;⁹¹ Josephus at one time as a coast, at another as an inland town.⁹² The latter is more accurate, for it lay, as the present Asdud does, more than a league inland, on which account *Ἀζωτος παράλιος* is in Christian times distinguished from *Ἀζωτος μεσόγειος*.⁹³ The district of Azotus is frequently mentioned in the Books of the Maccabees; but no certain conclusions can be drawn therefrom as to its extent.⁹⁴ Nor are any further details of its fate under the Ptolemies and Seleucidae known.^{94a} At the time of the rising of the Maccabees Azotus was unable to maintain itself against Jewish supremacy. Judas already destroyed its altars and images (1 Macc. v. 68). Jonathan, however, devastated the city, together with its temple of Dagon, by fire (1 Macc. x. 84, xi. 4). At the time of Alexander Jannaeus the city, or rather its ruins, belonged to the Jewish region (Joseph. *Antt.* viii. 15. 4). Pompey again separated it from this latter, and made it a free town (*Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 7). But the ruined city was not restored till Gabinius (*Antt.* xiv. 5. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 8. 4). It possibly came, together with the other maritime towns, under the dominion of Herod (B.C. 30), from whom it passed after his death to his sister Salome (*Antt.* xvii. 8. 1, 11. 5; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 3). Whether, like Jamnia, it fell after her death to the

⁹⁰ Herodot. ii. 157. See on the subject generally, Reland, *Palaestina*, pp. 606–609. Winer, *RWB.*, s.v. Asdod. Pauly, *Real-Enc.* i. 2. 2208 sq. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xvi. 94–100. Raumer, *Paläst.* p. 174; Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung*, pp. 26–32. Guérin, *Judée*, ii. 70–78; *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, ii. 409 sq., 421 sqq., also sheet xvi. of the large English chart.

⁹¹ Ptolem.

⁹² As a coast town, *Antt.* xiii. 15. 4; as an inland town, *Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 7; comp. Kuhn, ii. 362, 364.

⁹³ Hieróclis, *Synecdemus*, ed. Parthey (1866), p. 43.

⁹⁴ 1 Macc. xiv. 34, xvi. 10.

^{94a} On two interesting coins of Asdod, probably of the first Diadochian period, see Georg Hoffmann in Sallet's *Zeitschr. für Numismatik*, vol. ix. 1882, p. 96 sq. The superscription of the coins is Hebrew, but in Greek characters. On the one is IP ΑΣΔΩΔΑΣΙΝΑ, i.e. עיר אשדוד חסינה (the strong city of Ashdod); on the other IP ΑΣ IPOM H, i.e. probably the city of Ashdod in the eighth year of Hirom (the king of the city).

Empress Livia is not quite certain, since Azotus is not expressly named (*Antt.* xviii. 2. 2; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 1). It is probable that a considerable portion of its population was Jewish, on which account Vespasian was obliged, during the Jewish war, to place a garrison in it (*Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 2). Coins of Azotus during the Roman period seem not to have been preserved.⁹⁵

6. *Jamnia*, *Ἰάμνεια*, in the Old Testament Jabneh, יַבְנֵה (2 Chron. xxvi. 6), under which name it frequently occurs in Rabbinic literature.⁹⁶ Jamnia, like Azotus, is sometimes called a maritime, sometimes an inland town,⁹⁷ for it lay considerably inland, but had a port. Both are correctly distinguished by Pliny and Ptolemy.⁹⁸ There is express testimony that Jamnia had a district.⁹⁹ According to Strabo, it was so densely populated that Jamnia and its neighbourhood were able to furnish 40,000 fighting men.¹⁰⁰ In the Maccabaeon period Jamnia was—at least according to the second Book of the Maccabees—attacked by Judas, and its port together with the fleet burnt.¹⁰¹ The town itself however did not

⁹⁵ The coins with the legend *Τυχὴ Ἀσωτίων*, which older numismatics have referred to this town (Eckhel, iii. 448; Mionnet, v. 534; *Suppl.* viii. 370), are rightly denied to belong to it by de Saulcy (*Numism.* p. 282 sq.), even on account of the σ instead of ζ [also in the Pseudo-Aristeas *Ἀσωτίων χώραν* is, according to Mor. Schmid in Merx's *Archiv*, i. 275, 6, the correct reading, instead of *Ἀζωτίων χώραν*].

⁹⁶ Mishna, *Shekalim* i. 4; *Rosh hashana* ii. 8, 9, iv. 1, 2; *Kethuboth* iv. 6; *Sanhedrin* xi. 4; *Edujoth* ii. 4; *Aboth* iv. 4; *Bechoroth* iv. 5, vi. 8; *Kelim* v. 4; *Para* vii. 6. For the passages of the *Tosefta*, see the index to Zuckermann's edition (1882). Neubauer, *La Géographie du Talmud*, 1868, pp. 73–76.

⁹⁷ Maritime town, *Antt.* xviii. 15. 4. Inland town, *Antt.* iv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 7; comp. Kuhn, ii. 362 sq.

⁹⁸ Plinius, *H. N.* v. 13. 68: *Jamneae duae, altera intus.* Ptolem. v. 16. 2: *Ἰαμνεῖτῶν λιμὴν*; v. 16. 6: *Ἰάμνεια*. See generally, Reland, p. 823 sq. Winer, *RWB.*, s.v. "Jabne." Pauly, *Real-Enc.* iv. 17. Raumer, p. 203 sq. Ritter, xvi. 125 sq. Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung*, pp. 20–25. Guérin, *Judée*, ii. 53–65. *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, ii. 414, 441–433; also sheet xvi. of the large English chart.

⁹⁹ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iii. 5: *Ἰάμνεια καὶ Ἰόπη τῶν περιόρων ἀφηγῶνται*.

¹⁰⁰ Strabo, xvi. p. 759. Strabo here indeed erroneously calls Jamnia *ἡ πόλις*.

¹⁰¹ 2 Macc. xii. 8 sq., 40; comp. Stark, *Gaza*, p. 487.

come into the possession of the Jews either then, or, as Josephus asserts, under Simon.¹⁰² It was not till Alexander Jannaeus that it formed a portion of the Jewish territory (*Antt.* xiii. 15. 4). Pompey again separated it from the latter (*Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 7), Gabinius restored it. Like Azotus, Jamnia must also have come into the possession of Herod, since it was left by him to his sister Salome (*Antt.* xvii. 8. 1, 11. 5; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 3). The Empress Livia received it from the latter (*Antt.* xviii. 2. 2; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 1), and after her death it seems to have become a private possession of Tiberius (*Antt.* xviii. 6. 3; see above, p. 55). The population was then a mixed one of Jews and heathen, but with a preponderance of the Jewish element.¹⁰³ This explains the fact, that Vespasian twice found himself obliged to garrison the city,¹⁰⁴ and that Jamnia, after the destruction of Jerusalem, soon became a headquarter of Jewish learning.

7. *Joppa*, *Ἰόπη* or *Ἰόππη*,¹⁰⁵ Hebr. יָבְיָ,¹⁰⁶ the present Jaffa.

¹⁰² Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 6. 6; *Bell. Jud.* i. 2. 2. See, on the other hand, 1 Macc. x. 69, xv. 40.

¹⁰³ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 30 (*Mang.* ii. 575): ταύτην μιγάδες οἰκοῦσιν οἱ πλείους μὲν Ἰουδαῖοι, ἔτεροι δὲ τινες ἀλλόφυλοι παρεισφθαρέντες ἀπὸ τῶν πλησιοχώρων, οἱ τοῖς τρόποις τινὰ αὐθιγενέσιν ὄντες μέτοικοι, κακὰ καὶ πράγματα παρέχουσιν, ὥς τι παραλύντες τῶν πατρίων Ἰουδαίους. Philo, indeed, by here assigning the part of natives to the Jews, and that of *metoikoi* to the heathen, reverses the true order of things. For even in the Maccabaeian period Jamnia was a chiefly heathen city, nor was it till afterwards that its Jewish element increased.

¹⁰⁴ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 2, 8. 1.

¹⁰⁵ The orthography fluctuates. In the texts of non-biblical authors the form *Ἰόπη*, which is required by Greek grammarians, is preferred (see Movers, *Phönicië*, ii. 2. 176, note 73. Mendelssohn in Ritschl's *Acta societ. philol. Lips.* vol. v. p. 104) and corroborated by the usage of poets (Alexander Ephesius in *Steph. Byz.*, ed. Meineke, p. 255: Δῶρός τ' ἀρχιχάλης τ' Ἰόπη προύχουσα θαλάσσης, also Dionys. *Perieg.* in Müller, *Geogr. gr. min.* ii. 160: αἶτ' Ἰόπην καὶ Γάζαν Ἑλαῖδα τ' ἐνναίουσι). The biblical manuscripts, on the contrary, have, as it appears, universally *Ἰόππη*, whether in the Old or New Testament (1 Maccabees and Acts). Of the few coins that have been preserved some have one, some the other form. The Greek *Ἰόπη* is related to יָבְיָ as *Ἀκκ* is to יָבְיָ. But it might also arise from the form יָבְיָ (concluding with Jod), as the name is given on the inscription of Eschmunazar. See Schlottmann, *Die Inschrift Eschmunazars* (1868), p. 150 sqq.

¹⁰⁶ Josh. xix. 46; Jonah i. 3; 2 Chron. ii. 15; Ezra iii. 7. Mishna,

The special importance of Joppa is found in the fact that it was comparatively the best harbour on the coast of Palestine¹⁰⁷ It was therefore at almost all periods the chief place of debarkation for the interior of Judaea, and its possession, especially on the greater development of trade and commerce in later times, was almost a vital question for the Jews. In the Persian period, and indeed in the time of the Sidonian King Eschmunazar, Joppa was granted to the Sidonians by the "Lord of Kings," *i.e.* by the Persian monarch.^{107a} To the Greeks it was chiefly known as the scene of the myth of Perseus and Andromeda, and is mentioned as such even before the time of Alexander the Great by Scylax (see above, p. 15). In the Diadochian period it seems to have been an important arsenal. When Antigonus wrested Coelesyria from Ptolemy Lagos, he was obliged to take Joppa as well as other places by force.¹⁰⁸ And when, three years later (312 B.C.), Ptolemy Lagos found he could not hold the reconquered region against Antigonus, he had Joppa razed on his retreat as one of the more important fortresses.¹⁰⁹ In the time of the Maccabees

Nedarim iii. 6; Tosefta, *Demai* i. 11 (ed. Zuckermann, p. 46, 1). Neubauer, *La Géographie du Talmud*, p. 81 sq.

¹⁰⁷ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iii. 9. 3 indeed describes the harbour as dangerous, which it still is. It must, however, have been *comparatively* the best. According to Diodor. i. 13, there was but one safe harbour (*ἀσφαλὴ λιμένας*), viz. the Pharos of Alexandria from Paraetionium in Libya to Joppa in Coelesyria. Strabo too (xvi. p. 759) rightly gives prominence to the importance of Joppa as a port for Judaea. See especially 1 Macc. xiv. 5. Compare on the subject in general, Reland, pp. 864–867. Winer, *RWB.* Pauly, *Real-Enc.* Schenkel, *Bibelles.* s.v. Ritter, xvi. 574–580. Raumer, p. 204 sq. Tobler, *Topographie von Jerusalem*, ii. 576–637. Sepp, *Jerusalem* (2nd ed.), i. 1–22. Guérin, *Judée*, i. 1–22. Bäderker-Socin., *Palästina* (1st ed.), p. 131 sqq., with plan. Schwarz, *Jafa und Umgebung, mit Plan* (*Zeitschr. d. deutschen Pal.-Ver.* iii. 44 sqq.). *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, ii. 254–258, 275–278; also sheet xiii. of the large English chart.

^{107a} See the inscription of Eschmunazar, line 18–19, and Schlottmann, as above, pp. 83–147 sqq. The text is best given in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, vol. i. (1881) pp. 9–20.

¹⁰⁸ Diodor. xix. 59. Comp. Droysen, *Hellenismus*, ii. 2. 11. Stark, *Gaza*, p. 350.

¹⁰⁹ Diodor. xix. 93. Comp. Droysen, ii. 2. 54. Stark, p. 355 sq.

the efforts of the Jews were especially directed to obtain possession of this important place. It is true that Judas Maccabaeus—if the account is quite trustworthy—only destroyed the port and fleet of Joppa during a nocturnal attack (2 Macc. xii. 3–7). Jonathan however, in the year 147 or 146 B.C., made a serious assault of the town, in consequence of which the inhabitants opened the gates to him and forced the Syrian garrison to depart (1 Macc. x. 75, 76). Thenceforward the Jews remained with but slight intermission in possession of the town till the time of Pompey. From the same period also must be dated the *Judaizing of the city*. For when, a few years after its conquest by Jonathan, the inhabitants showed signs of again surrendering the town to the Syrians, Simon, the brother of Jonathan, stationed a Jewish garrison in it (1 Macc. xii. 33, 34) and compelled the heathen inhabitants to leave the town (1 Macc. xiii. 11: ἐξέβαλε τοὺς ὄντας ἐν αὐτῇ).¹¹⁰ Simon then enlarged and improved the harbour and fortified the town (1 Macc. xiv. 5, 34). When the energetic Antiochus VII. (Sidetes) endeavoured again to retrench the power of the Jews, the possession of Joppa was a main point of dispute. Even while Antiochus was contending with Trypho, he demanded from Simon the surrender of Joppa (1 Macc. xv. 28–30). The latter however declared himself only ready to pay a sum of money instead (1 Macc. xv. 35). When, some years later, in the beginning of the reign of John Hyrcanus, all Palestine was conquered and even Jerusalem besieged by Antiochus, it is probable that Joppa had already been taken by him. He was nevertheless satisfied at the conclusion of a peace with the payment of a tribute for Joppa (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 8. 3).¹¹¹ Thus the town continued in the possession of the Jews, and

¹¹⁰ Comp. Stark, p. 493 sq. A similar procedure was observed towards Gazara.

¹¹¹ The seizure of Joppa by an Antiochus is assumed in two Roman Senatus-consultus, in the latter of which its surrender is commanded him by the Roman Senate (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 9. 2, xiv. 10. 22). Perhaps this

in later times even the payment of the tribute ceased. There is express testimony that Alexander Jannaeus possessed Joppa (*Antt.* xiii. 15. 4). This maritime city was however taken by Pompey from the Jews, who were thus entirely cut off from the sea (*Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 7). Among the favours bestowed by Caesar on the Jews one of the most valuable was the restoration of Joppa (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 6).¹¹² It is not quite certain whether Herod held Joppa from the first. At any rate, like the other coast towns, it belonged, during the years 34–30 B.C., to Cleopatra (see above, § 15), and thenceforth to Herod (*Antt.* xv. 7. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 20. 3).¹¹³ From this time it was always united with Judaea proper, and hence passed after Herod's death to Archelaus (*Antt.* xvii. 11. 4; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 3), and was after his deposition under Roman procurators. At the beginning of the Jewish war, Joppa was, by reason of its mainly Jewish population, a central seat of rebellion. It was destroyed at the very beginning of the war by Cestius Gallus (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 10), but soon fortified again and conquered a second time by Vespasian (*Bell. Jud.* iii. 9. 2–4). From that time it probably again became a chiefly heathen town. It is shown by a coin recently discovered, that it was also called Flavia, which leads to the inference of its re-foundation in the time of Vespasian.^{113a} Notwithstanding its close connection with Judaea, Joppa formed an independent

explains the striking leniency of Antiochus in the conditions of peace. It is however just questionable, whether Antiochus Sidetes is meant.

¹¹² For further details, see above, § 15.

¹¹³ The Jews having been in possession of Joppa since Caesar, and it being expressly said of Joppa, that Herod conquered it when he took possession of his kingdom (*Antt.* xiv. 15. 1; *Bell. Jud.* i. 15. 3, 4), it must be supposed that it was his from the beginning of his reign, and that he then obtained it *again* in the year 30, after the short interregnum of Cleopatra. The only difficulty is, that at the enlargement of his domains in the year 30, Joppa is named, not as a portion of the domains *again* bestowed on Herod, but expressly as among the towns *newly* bestowed *besides* these.

^{113a} Darricarrère, *Sur une monnaie inédite de Joppe* (*Revue archéologique*, nouv. série, vol. xliii. 1882, p. 74 sq.). The coin is of the time of Elagabalus, and bears the inscription: *Ιοππης Φλαουίας*.

political community after the manner of Hellenistic towns.¹¹⁴ Of its coins few specimens have been preserved.¹¹⁵

8. *Apollonia*, Ἀπολλωνία. An Apollonia between Joppa and Caesarea is mentioned by geographers down to the later imperial period.¹¹⁶ It occurs only twice in history: at the time of Alexander Jannaeus, when it belonged to the Jewish region (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 15. 4), and at the time of Gabinius, who restored it (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* i. 8. 4). According to the statement of distance in the Peutinger table (22 *m. p.* from Caesarea) it must have been situate where the present Arsuf is.¹¹⁷ Stark's supposition, that it is identical with Σώζουσα, is commended by the circumstance, that in Cyrenaica also an Apollonia and a Sozusa appear, which are probably identical. Sozusa would thus be the town of Apollo Σωτήρ.¹¹⁸ The name Apollonia makes it probable, that it was founded by Seleucus I. in the time of the definitive occupation of Coelesyria by the Ptolemies.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁴ This appears chiefly from the manner in which Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 5) mentions Joppa *beside* Judaea proper: μεθ' ἧς Ἰάμνεια καὶ Ἰόπη τῶν περιόρων ἀφηγοῦνται. In *Bell. Jud.* iii. 9. 4 also, the πῶμαι and πολίχνηαι τῆς Ἰόπης are mentioned.

¹¹⁵ Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* iii. 433. Mionnet, v. 499. De Saulcy, p. 176 sq., pl. ix. n. 3, 4. Reichardt, *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1862, p. 111; and *Wiener Numismat. Monatshefte*, published by Egger, vol. iii. 1867, p. 192. Daricarrère, as above.

¹¹⁶ Plinius, *H. N.* v. 13. 69. Ptolem. v. 16. 2. *Tabula Peutinger. Segm.* ix. *Geographus Ravennas*, ed. Pinder et Parthey (1860), pp. 83 and 356. *Guidonis Geogr.* in the above-named edition of the *Geogr. Ravenn.* p. 524. Steph. *Byz.*, s.v. Ἀπολλωνία, reckons twenty-five towns of this name, No. 12 among them: περὶ τὴν Κοίλην Συρίαν; No. 13: κατὰ Ἰόπην (this being the one now in question); No. 20: Συρίας κατὰ Ἀπάμειαν.

¹¹⁷ See in general, Reland, p. 573. Ritter, xvi. 590. Pauly's *Enc.* i. 2. 1308. Kuhn, ii. 362. Guérin, *Samarie*, ii. 375-382. *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, ii. 135, 137-140 (with plan); also sheet x. of the large English chart. De Saulcy, *Numismatique*, p. 110 sq., pl. vi. n. 1, 2.

¹¹⁸ Σώζουσα in Hierocles, ed. Parthey, p. 44. Comp. Stark, *Gaza*, p. 452. On Sozusa in Cyrenaica, Forbinger, *Handb.* ii. 829.

¹¹⁹ Appian. *Syr.* 57 does not indeed mention our town, but speaks of Apollonia as a Macedonian town-name transplanted into Syria by Seleucus I. Comp. Stark, as above.

9. *Straton's Tower*, *Στράτωνος πύργος*, afterwards Caesarea.¹²⁰ Like Apollonia, Straton's Tower may have been a foundation of the Hellenistic period, perhaps at first a castle, so called after a general of the Ptolemies. It is however possible, that it was founded towards the end of the Persian period by a Sidonian king of the name of Straton.¹²¹ Artemidorus, about 100 B.C., is the first geographical author by whom it is mentioned.¹²² At that period too it first occurs in history, being mentioned in the time of Aristobulus I., 104 B.C. (*Antt.* xiii. 11. 2). In the beginning of the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, a "tyrant," Zoilus was master of Straton's Tower and

¹²⁰ See generally, Reland, pp. 670–678. Raumer, p. 152 sq. Winer, *RWB.*, and Schenkel's *Bibellex. s.v.* Caesarea. Pauly, *Real-Enc.* ii. 47. Kuhn, *Die städt. und bürgerl. Verfassung*, ii. 347–350. The same, *Ueber die Entstehung der Städte der Alten* (1878), pp. 423–433. Ritter, xvi. 598–607. Sepp, *Jerusalem* (2nd ed.), ii. 573 sqq. Guérin, *Samarie*, ii. 321. *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, ii. 13–29 (with plans), also sheet vii. of the English chart.

¹²¹ In Justinian's *Novelle* 103 praef. it is said of Caesarea: *Καίτοι γε ἀρχαία τέ ἐστι καὶ αἰεὶ σεμνή, ἥνικα τε αὐτὴν Στράτων ἰδρύσατο πρῶτος, ὃς ἐξ Ἑλλάδος ἀναστὰς γέγονεν αὐτῆς οἰκιστὴς ἥνικα τε Οὐεσπασιανὸς . . . εἰς τὴν τῶν Καيسάρων αὐτὴν ἀνέμασε προσηγορίαν.* The worthlessness of this notice is shown already by the gross mistake with respect to Vespasian. As there was a *Straton's Island* on the Abyssinian coast of the Red Sea (Strabo, xvi. p. 770), Straton's Tower may have been a foundation of the Ptolemies. So Stark, *Gaza*, p. 451. To me however it seems almost more probable, that it was founded by the Sidonians. For towards the end of the Persian period they were in possession of the nearest towns both northward and southward, viz. Dora and Joppa (which see), and therefore presumably of the strip of coast also upon which Straton's Tower was built. Straton moreover was the name of one or more of the last kings of Sidon (see *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 87, and also Böckh). At any rate its designation as *πύργος*, tower, is not usual for a town of Hellenistic foundation. Lastly, L. Müller thinks, that a coin of Alexander the Great with the letters Στ may be referred to our Straton's Tower (L. Müller, *Numismatique d'Alexandre le Grand*, p. 306, plates, n. 1466), in which case it must already have been in existence in the time of Alexander the Great, or at latest in the Diadochian period (in which also coins of Alexander were issued). All this combined favours the view, that it was already founded by the Sidonians.

¹²² Artemidorus in *Steph. Byz. s.v.* Δῶρος (on Artemidorus, see Forbiger, *Handbuch der alten Geographie*, i. 246 sqq., 255 sqq. Pauly's *Enc. s.v.*). The latest geographer who knows of Straton's Tower by that name only is Strabo, xvi. p. 758.

Dora (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 12. 2). He was soon overthrown by Alexander Jannaeus (*Antt.* xiii. 12. 4), and hence Straton's Tower is named among the towns belonging to Alexander (*Antt.* xiii. 15. 4). It obtained its freedom from Pompey (*Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 7). It was bestowed upon Herod by Augustus (*Antt.* xv. 7. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 20. 3), and from this period dates the special importance of the town. For it was rebuilt on the most magnificent scale by Herod, and provided with artificial embankments and an excellent harbour (*Antt.* xv. 9. 6, xvi. 5. 1; *Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 5-8).¹²³ He called the town *Καيسάρεια* in honour of the emperor, and the harbour *Σεβαστὸς λιμὴν*.¹²⁴ Hence on Nero's coins we meet with *Καισαρια ἡ πρὸς Σεβαστῶ λιμενί*.¹²⁵ The designation *Καيسάρεια Σεβαστή* occurs only once.¹²⁶ Elsewhere the town is called in distinction from others *Καيسάρεια Στράτωνος*,¹²⁷ and in later times *Καيسάρεια τῆς Παλαιστίνης*.¹²⁸ It quickly attained to great prosperity, and remained for a long period one of the most important towns of Palestine.¹²⁹ After the death of Herod it passed with the rest of Judaea to

¹²³ Besides the above principal passages, compare also Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 8. 5. Plinius, v. 13. 69. On the time of its building, see above, § 15. On its constitution and political position, see especially Kuhn's above-named work.

¹²⁴ On the latter, see *Antt.* xvii. 5. 1; *Bell. Jud.* i. 31. 3.

¹²⁵ These coins are fully treated of by Belley in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, old series, vol. xxvi. 1759, pp. 440-445. Comp. also Eckhel, iii. 428 sq. Mionnet, *Description*, v. 486 sq. De Saulcy, *Numismatique*, p. 116 sq.

¹²⁶ Joseph. *Antt.* xvi. 5. 1. Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 38, ed. Mang. ii. 590. The designation *Αὐγουστα Καيسάρεια* occurring on an inscription (*Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4472 = Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscriptions*, vol. iii. n. 1839) is an abbreviation of *colonia prima Flavia Augusta Caesarea*, the official title of Caesarea as a colony since Vespasian; see below, p. 87, and Kuhn, ii. 349.

¹²⁷ Ptolém. v. 16. 2, viii. 20. 14. *Clement. Homil.* i. 15, 20, xiii. 7; *Recogn.* i. 12. Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscriptions*, vol. iii. n. 1620^b (Inscription of Aphrodisias in Caria of the second century after Christ, comp. above, p. 24).

¹²⁸ Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lagarde, pp. 207, 250. *De martyr. Palaestinae*, i. 2.

¹²⁹ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iii. 9. 1. *Clement. Recogn.* i. 12. Apollonius, *Tyan. epist.* xi. (in *Epistolographi graeci*, ed. Hercher, Paris 1873, Didot). *Totius orbis descriptio* in Müller, *Geogr. gr. minores*, ii. 517. Ammian. xiv. p. 11

Archelaus (*Antt.* xvii. 11. 4; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 3). It afterwards continued on all occasions united with Judaea, and hence came after the deposition of Archelaus under Roman procurators, then under Agrippa I., and then again under procurators. Coins of Agrippa I., which were coined in Caesarea, are still in existence.¹⁸⁰ His *στρατηγός* in Caesarea is incidentally mentioned (*Antt.* xix. 7. 4). It is well known that he himself died there (see above, § 18). He was hated by the Caesareans for his Judaizing tendencies (*Antt.* xix. 9. 1). The Roman procurators, both before and after the reign of Agrippa, took up their abode at Caesarea (see above, § 17^c). Hence the town is called in Tacitus, *Judaeae caput* (Tac. *Hist.* ii. 78). It was also the chief garrison for the troops under the command of the procurators, who were for the most part composed of natives (see above, p. 65). The population being chiefly a heathen one (*Bell. Jud.* iii. 9. 1), though mingled with a considerable Jewish fraction, disputes easily occurred, and the more so that both had equal civil rights, and had therefore to conduct the affairs of the town in common.^{180a} Neither the Jews nor the heathen were satisfied with this state of things. Each of these parties claimed the exclusive government of the town. Already towards the close of the official career of Felix there were sanguinary contests on the subject, in consequence of which Nero, whose adviser had been bribed by the heathen party, deprived the Jews of their equality of right, and declared the heathen sole governors of the town. The exasperation which ensued gave the first inducement to the great rising of the Jews in A.D. 66 (*Antt.* xx. 8. 7 and 9; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13. 7, 14. 4, 5). After the breaking out of the war, the Jews, as

¹⁸⁰ Eckhel, iii. 491, 492. Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage*, pp. 107, 109. The same, *Coins of the Jews* (1881), pp. 133, 136. The coins with the legend *Καίσαρ ραυλιν* are rightly denied by Eckhel to belong to our Caesarea.

^{180a} The *ἄνδρες οἱ κατ' ἐξοχὴν τῆς πόλεως*, mentioned Acts xxv. 23, must according to the context be regarded as heathen. This however does not exclude Jews from a share in the government, but merely corresponds with the preponderance of the heathen element testified to by Josephus.

the minority, fell victims to the fury of the heathen populace. It is said that all the Jewish inhabitants, 20,000 in number, were then assassinated in an hour (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1, vii. 8. 7, ed. Bekker, p. 161). Caesarea was changed by Vespasian into a Roman colony, though without the full *jus Italicum*.¹³¹ On coins it bears the title *col(onia) prima Fl(avia) Aug(usta) Caesarensis* or *Caesarea*. To this was added after the time of Alexander Severus the title *metropolis*, or as it is more completely given on coins after Decius, *metropolis, pr. S. Pal.* (= *provinciae Syriae Palaestinae*).¹³²

10. *Dora*, Δῶρα, in Polybius Δοῦρα, elsewhere also Δῶρος, in Pliny, *Dorum*,¹³³ Hebr. דור or דאר,¹³⁴ an old Phoenician

¹³¹ Plinius, *H. N.* v. 13. 69: Stratonis turris, eadem Caesarea, ab Herode rege condita, nunc colonia prima Flavia a Vespasiano imperatore deducta. *Digest.* lib. xv. 8. 7 (from Paulus): Divus Vespasianus Caesarienses colonos fecit non adjecto, ut et juris Italici essent, sed tributum his remisit capitis; sed divus Titus etiam solum immune factum interpretatus est. *Ibid.* lib. xv. 1. 6 (from Ulpianus): In Palaestina duae fuerunt coloniae, Caesariensis et Aelia Capitolina, sed neutra jus Italicum habet. Comp. Zumpt, *Commentationes epigr.* i. 397 sq. On the jus Italicum, see Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. 89 sqq. (1881). and the literature therein cited, p. 89, note 7, to which is to be added: Beaudouin, *Etude sur le Jus italicum*, Paris (1883). Comp. *Revue critique*, 1884, No. 6, pp. 99–101.

¹³² On the coins in general, see Eckhel, iii. 428–442. Mionnet, v. 486–497; *Suppl.* viii. 334–343. De Sauley, pp. 112–141, pl. vii.

¹³³ The form Δῶρος occurs especially in older authors, but is also preferred by Steph. Byz. Δῶρα was afterwards exclusively used. (1) Δῶρος is found in Scylax (fourth century B.C.), Apollodorus (about 140 B.C.), Alexander Ephesius (see on him Pauly's *Enc. s.v. Alex.* n. 40), Charax (the three last named in Steph. Byz. *s.v. Δῶρος*). To this series belongs also Pliny (*H. N.* v. 19. 75, *Dorum*). (2) Δῶρα or Δωρά found besides in 1 Macc., in Artemidorus (about 100 B.C.), Claudius Jolaus (both in Steph. Byz.), Josephus (constantly), on coins of Caligula, Trajan, Elagabalus (in De Sauley), Ptolemaeus (v. 15. 5), *Clement. Recogn.* (iv. 1), Eusebius (*Onom.*, ed. Lag. p. 250), Hieronymus (the same, p. 115), Hierocles (ed. Parthey, p. 43), the lists of bishops (in Le Quien, *Oriens christ.* iii. 574 sqq.), *Geographus Ravennas* (ed. Pinder et Parthey, pp. 89, 357). To this series belong also Polybius (v. 66, Δοῦρα) and *Tab. Peut.* (Thora). Comp. also note 136, below. The first Book of the Maccabees uses Δωρά indecl., it is elsewhere treated as a neut. plur. (Josephus usually; Eusebius, p. 280, the lists of bishops); sometimes also as a fem. sing. (*Joseph. Antt.* xiii. 7. 2; *c. Apion.* ii. 9. *Clement. Recogn.* iv. 1).

¹³⁴ דור, Josh. xi. 2, xii. 23; Judg. i. 27; 1 Chron. vii. 29. דאר, Josh.

settlement 8 or 9 miles north of Caesarea.¹⁸⁵ It was known from ancient times to the Greeks, being already mentioned by Hecataeus of Miletus, who lived 500 years before Christ, in his description of the earth.¹⁸⁶ Nay, it is possible that it may, during the hegemony of Athens in the Mediterranean in the 5th century B.C., have been tributary to the Athenians.^{186a} In the time of the Sidonian King Eshmunazar it was granted to the Sidonians by the "Lord of Kings," i.e. by the Persian monarch.¹⁸⁷ Hence Scylax, whose description refers to the

xvii. 11; 1 Kings iv. 11. Also upon the inscription of Eshmunazar, see below, note 137. In the O. T. נֶפֶת דֹּר (Josh. xii. 23; 1 Kings iv. 11) or דֹּר נֶפֶת (Josh. xi. 2), properly the height or heights of Dor, and therefore probably the hill country, which lay inland from Dor, is distinguished from the town of Dor (see Riehm's *Wörterbuch*, s.v.). Only the former and not the maritime town was possessed by Solomon. Less probable is Movers' notion (*Phönicier*, ii. 2. 175 sq.), that Naphath-Dor is distinguished as an inland town from Dor as a coast town.

¹⁸⁵ The foundation by the Phoenicians is fully described by Claudius Jolaus in Steph. Byz. s.v. Δῶρος (also in Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iv. 363). Josephus also calls Dora a πόλις τῆς Φοινίκης (*Vita*, 8; c. *Apion.* ii. 9). The distance from Caesarea, 8 m. p. according to *Tab. Peut.*; 9 m. p. according to Eusebius (*Onom.*, ed. Lag. p. 283) and Jerome (the same, pp. 115, 142). According to Artemidorus (in Steph. Byz. s.v.), Dora lay ἐπὶ χερσονησοειδοῦς τόπου. Comp. generally, Reland, pp. 738-741; Raumer, p. 154; Winer, Schenkel, Pauly, s.v.; Ritter, xvi. 607-612; Guérin, *Samarie*, ii. 305-315. *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchen, ii. pp. 3, 7-11; also sheet vii. of the English chart.

¹⁸⁶ Hecataeus in Steph. Byz. s.v. Δῶρος (also in Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* i. 17, n. 260): μετὰ δὲ ἡ πάλαι Δῶρος, νῦν δὲ Δῶρα καλεῖται. The words cannot indeed have come down just as they stand from Hecataeus, because they manifest a change in the usage of the language, which did not fully take place till about 500 years later (see above, note 133). Hence the copy made use of by Steph. Byz. must here have had an interpolation. On Hecataeus, see Forbiger, *Handbuch der alten Geogr.* i. 48 sqq. C. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* t. i. Proleg. pp. ix.-xvi. Westermann in Pauly's *Enc.* iii. 1082 sq.

^{186a} The Δῶρος tributary to the Athenians is indeed generally taken to be a town in Caria (according to Steph. Byz. s.v. Δῶρος). Such an one however not being elsewhere known of, and the power of the Athenians extending in any case to Cyprus, we may perhaps suppose it to have been the Phoenician Doros. See Ullr. Köhler, *Urkunden und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Delisch-attischen Bundes* (*Transactions of the Berlin Academy*, 1869), pp. 121, 207. Six, *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1877, p. 235.

¹⁸⁷ See the inscription of Eshmunazar, lines 18, 19, in the *Corp. Inscript.*

Persian period, rightly calls Dora a town of the Sidonians.¹³⁸ Although Dora was no large city,¹³⁹ it was on account of its favourable position a strong fortress. When Antiochus the Great made (219 B.C.) his first attack upon Coelesyria, he besieged Dora, but in vain.¹⁴⁰ Eighty years afterwards (139–138 B.C.) Trypho was here besieged by Antiochus Sidetes with a large army, but equally without result. The siege ended with the flight of Trypho.¹⁴¹ On a coin of Trypho's stamped at Dora the town is called *ἱε(ρὰ) κ(αὶ) ἄ(στυλος)*.¹⁴² Some decades afterwards we find it in the possession of the tyrant Zoilus (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 12. 2), who was afterwards overthrown by Alexander Jannaeus (*Antt.* xiii. 12. 4). It must therefore have subsequently belonged to the Jewish region, but was again separated from it by Pompey (*Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 7). Like many other towns, Dora also then began a new era, which it continued to use on coins of the imperial age.¹⁴³ It was restored by Gabinius (*Antt.* xiv. 5. 3). After Pompey

Semiticarum, vol. i. (1881) pp. 9–20; also Schlottmann, *Die Inschrift Eschmunazar* (1868), pp. 82 sq., 146 sqq.

¹³⁸ Scylax in *Geographi graeci minores*, ed. Müller, i. 79: *Δῶρος πόλις Σιδονίαν*. On Scylax, see e.g. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. gr.* iv. 606 sqq. Forbiger, *Handb. d. alten Geogr.* i. 113 sqq., 123 sqq. Westermann in Pauly's *Enc.* vi. 1. 891 sq. Nicolai, *Griech. Literaturgesch.* i. 322 sq. Anonymi vulgo *Scylacis Caryandensis periplum maris interni cum appendice*, iterum rec. Fabricius, Lips. 1878.

¹³⁹ Artemidorus: *πολιςμάτιον*. Claudius Jolaus: *βραχεῖα πολίχνη* (both in Steph. Byz.). *Clement. Recogn.* iv. 1: breve oppidum.

¹⁴⁰ Polyb. v. 66.

¹⁴¹ 1 Macc. xv. 11–37; Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 7. 2.

¹⁴² Mionnet, v. 72. Stark, p. 477.

¹⁴³ The commencement of the era cannot be strictly determined. At all events however it is that of Pompey (B.C. 63?), not that of Gabinius, as De Saulcy, in spite of his own objections assumes, for an era of Gabinius could not begin earlier than the autumn of 58 B.C.=696 A.U.C. and then 175 aer. Dor., of which year coins of Trajan are in existence, would be=870/871 A.U.C., while Trajan was already dead before the autumn of 870. See generally, Noris, iv. 5. 5 (ed. Lips. pp. 453–458). Pellerin, *Recueil de médailles de peuples et de villes* (3 vols. Paris 1763), ii. 216 sq. Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* iii. 362 sq. Ideler, *Handb. der Chronologie*, i. 459. The coins in Mionnet, v. 359–362; *Suppl.* viii. 258–260. De Saulcy, pp. 142–148, pl. vi. n. 6–12.

it was under direct Roman government, and therefore never belonged to Herod (whose dominions on the coast extended no farther northward than Caesarea). It is called on coins of the imperial period *ἱερὰ ἄσυλος αὐτόνομος ναυαρχίς*.¹⁴⁴ The existence of a Jewish community in Dora is evidenced by an occurrence of the time of King Agrippa I.: a number of young people once placed a statue of the emperor in the Jewish synagogue, and it needed energetic intervention on the part of Petronius the governor, in a letter addressed to the authorities of Dora (*Δωριτῶν τοῖς πρώτοις*), to secure to the Jews that free exercise of their religion, which had been pledged to them (*Antt.* xix. 6. 3). In the later imperial period, Dora seems to have fallen into decay.¹⁴⁵ Christian bishops of Dora are however mentioned down to the 7th century.¹⁴⁶

11. *Ptolemais*, *Πτολεμαῖς*.¹⁴⁷ The original name of the town was Akko, אַכּוֹ (Richter 1. 31), or, as it reads in Greek, Ἀκκῆ. By this name it was already known to the Greeks in pre-Hellenistic times.¹⁴⁸ It was here that in the year

¹⁴⁴ See especially Mionnet and De Saulcy, as above.

¹⁴⁵ Hieronymus, *Onomast.*, ed. Lagarde, p. 115: Dora . . . nunc deserta. *Ibid.* p. 142: Dor autem est oppidum jam desertum. The same, *Peregrinatio Paulae* (in Tobler, *Palaestinae descriptiones*, 1869, p. 13): ruinas Dor, urbis quondam potentissimae.

¹⁴⁶ Le Quien, *Oriens christianus*, iii. 574–579.

¹⁴⁷ For a description of the situation, see Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 10. 2. Compare in general, Reland, pp. 534–542. Pauly, *Real-Enc.* vi. 1. 243. Winer, s.v. "Acco." Raumer, p. 119 sq. Ritter, xvi. 725–739. Robinson, *Recent Scriptural Researches in Palestine*, iii. 89–101. Sepp, *Jerusalem*, ii. 513 sqq. Guérin, *Galilée*, i. 502–525. Bäder-Socin, *Paläst.* 1st ed. p. 369 sqq. (with plan of the present Akka). *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, i. 145, 160–167, also sheet iii. of the English chart. Ebers and Guthe, *Palästina*, vol. ii. p. 450.

¹⁴⁸ Scylax in *Geogr. gr. min.*, ed. Müller, i. 79. Isaeus, *Orat.* iv. 7. Demosthenes, *Orat.* 52 *contra Callippum*, § 24 (where indeed the word Ἀκκῆ is first restored in Dindorf's edit. after the gloss in Harpocration, *Lex.* s.v. Ἀκκῆ, the earlier edition having Θρακκῆν). Diodor. xv. 41, xix. 93. Polyæn. iii. 9. 56. Cornel. Nepos, xiv. Datames, c. 5. Comp. Strabo, xvi. p. 758. Plinius, *H. N.* v. 19. 75. Charax in Steph. Byz. s.v. Δώρος. Claudius Jolaus in Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀκκῆ. Steph. Byz. *ibid.* and s.v. Πτολεμαῖς. The Lexicographers, *Etymolog. magn.*, Harpocration, Suidas (see the passages in Reland, p. 536 sq.; also Kuhn, ii. 331). A coin of Ἀκκῆ in Mionnet, v. 473; De Saulcy, p. 154, pl. viii. n. 2; some others in

374 B.C. the army of Artaxerxes Mnemon assembled for the campaign against Egypt.¹⁴⁹ Ake must have been an important town in the time of Alexander the Great. For among the coins of Alexander stamped in Phoenicia those of Ake especially are very numerous. They have the name of Alexander in Greek, that of the town in Phoenician characters (Ἀλεξάνδρου, עכ, sometimes עכא), and the year of an era beginning with Alexander the Great. As elsewhere so too in Ake these coins were still issued long after the death of Alexander.¹⁵⁰ Ake was levelled to the ground in the year 312 by Ptolemy Lagos, when he again evacuated before Antigonos the district of Coelesyria, which he had just conquered.¹⁵¹ It probably received from Ptolemy II. the

Reichardt, *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1862, p. 108; 1864, p. 187. *Wiener Numismat. Monatshefte*, published by Egger, vol. ii. 1866, p. 3. On the ancient history of Ake, comp. especially the fragment from Menander in Joseph. *Antt.* ix. 14. 2 (Ake revolts from Tyre in the time of Shalmanezar, and goes over to Shalmanezar).

¹⁴⁹ Diod. xv. 41. This is referred to also by Polyæn. iii. 9. 56; Cornel. Nep. xiv. 5; comp. Strabo, xvi. p. 758: Εἰθ' ἡ Πτολεμαῖς ἐστὶ μεγάλη πόλις ἣν Ἀκην ἀνύμαζον, πρότερον ἢ ἐχρῶντο ὀρμητηρίῳ πρὸς τὴν Αἰγυπτὸν οἱ Πέρσαι.

¹⁵⁰ See Eckhel, iii. 408 sq.; Mionnet, i. 520 sq.; also *Recueil des planches*, pl. xxi. n. 1-10; *Suppl.* iii. 197 sq. and pl. ii. n. 1-6. Gesenius, *Scripturae linguaeque Phoeniciae monumenta*, p. 269 sq. L. Müller, *Numismatique d'Alexandre le Grand* (1855), p. 303; also *planches*, n. 1424-1463. Numerous copies of these coins (gold staters of Alexander, especially those of the years 23 and 24) have become known by means of a large discovery of coins at Sidon in the year 1863. See W(eckbecker) in the *Wiener Numismatischen Monatsheften*, pub. by Egger, vol. i. 1865, pp. 5-11. Waddington in the *Revue Numismatique*, 1865, pp. 3-25. Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus* (2nd ed.), i. 1. 302-304. The same, *Monatsber. der Berliner Akademie*, 1877, p. 40 sqq. Weckbecker in Egger's *Wiener Numismat. Monatsheften*, i. 98, 99, tells of tetradrachmas of Ake of Alexander the Great with the years 16, 22, 31, 32, which "were brought to market in Beirut by an Armenian of Mossul at about the same time (1862-1863)." A collection of the whole material may be expected in the *Corp. Inscr. Semiticarum*. On the fact that coins were issued with the name of Alexander after his death, see L. Müller, *Numismatique d'Alexandre le Grand*, pp. 50-90. The numbers of the years on the coins of Ake are 5-46. Since the year 334 or 333 must be accepted as the starting-point, these coins were issued not only till 306, when the Diadochoi assumed the royal title, but also till about two decades afterwards. See especially, Müller, pp. 80-83.

¹⁵¹ Diodor. xix. 93. Comp. above, note 52 (Gaza) and 109 (Joppa).

name of *Πτολεμαῖς*, which was henceforth the prevailing one.¹⁵² Still its original name Akko was uninterruptedly maintained beside the Greek one, which it subsequently supplanted.¹⁵³ In the Seleucid period also Ptolemais figures as one of the most important cities of the Phoenician-Philistine coast. The conquest of this region by Antiochus the Great in the year 219 was much facilitated by the surrender to him of the towns of Tyre and Ptolemais by the Phoenician general Theodotus.¹⁵⁴ Antiochus wintered in Ptolemais in 218/219.¹⁵⁵ The Seleucidae after their definitive occupation of Phoenicia specially favoured Ptolemais. On coins, especially those of the times of Antiochus IV. and VIII., the inhabitants are called *Ἀντιοχεῖς οἱ ἐν Πτολεμαίδι*, sometimes with the addition *ἱερὰ ἄστυλος*, sometimes *ἱερὰ αὐτόνομος*. The bestowal of the title "Antiochians," and with it perhaps certain privileges, is to be regarded as a mark of favour, which was aspired after by many other towns, e.g. Jerusalem, during the predominance of the Hellenistic party.¹⁵⁶ Seleucid coins of Antiochus V.,

¹⁵² The founding and naming of the town is expressly referred to Ptolemy in *Pseudo-Aristeas* (ed. Moritz Schmidt in *Merx' Archiv*, vol. i. p. 274): *Πτολεμαίδα τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐκτισμένην*. This is also probable in itself. Ptolemy II. was the first of the Ptolemies, who continued in possession of Phoenicia and Coelesyria. That he there undertook the founding of towns is proved by the example of Philadelphia (see below). Already in 219–217 Ptolemais is mentioned under this name in Polybius, without his pointing out that it was then not as yet known by this name (Polyb. v. 61–62. 71). Comp. also Droysen, iii. 2. 305.

¹⁵³ The name *akko* occurs especially in Rabbinic literature, see Mishna, *Nedarim* iii. 6; *Gittin* i. 2, vii. 7; *Aboda sara* iii. 4; *Ohaloth* xviii. 9. The passages of the Tosefta in the Index to Zuckermann's ed. (1882). Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, p. 231 sq. To this very day the town is called Akka (Acre).

¹⁵⁴ Polyb. v. 61–62. Comp. Stark, *Gaza*, p. 375 sqq. ¹⁵⁵ Polyb. v. 71.

¹⁵⁶ On the coins in question, see Eckhel, iii. 305 sq. Mionnet, v. 37 sq., 88, 216–218. Gardner, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum, Seleucid Kings*, p. 41. Even the circumstance that *ἱερὰ ἄστυλος* appears as an apposition to *Ἀντιοχεῖς* (*Ἀντιοχέων τῶν ἐν Πτολεμαίδι ἱερᾶς ἄστυλου*, and similarly on the coins of Hippias, see below, No. 13), proves that the town of Ptolemais and its citizens collectively, not a colony of Antiochian merchants in Ptolemais, is intended (the latter is the view of Eckhel and Kuhn, i. 22; see, on the other hand, Stark, p. 449; Droysen, iii. 2. 305).

Demetrius I., Alexander Balas, and Trypho, minted at Ptolemais, are in existence.¹⁵⁷ The town was used as a residence by the kings during their temporary abode in these regions (1 Macc. x. 56–60, xi. 22, 24). It always showed itself hostile to the Jews. Even at the beginning of the Maccabæan rising, it was especially the towns of Ptolemais, Tyre and Sidon, which fought against the Jews, who had revolted from Syrian sovereignty (1 Macc. v. 15 sqq.). Jonathan was here treacherously taken prisoner by Trypho (1 Macc. xii. 45 sqq.). After the accession of Alexander Jannæus, B.C. 104, when the Seleucidae had already lost all authority in the southern parts of their dominions, three neighbouring powers contended for the possession of Ptolemais. At first Alexander Jannæus entertained the purpose of conquering it, but was prevented from carrying out his design by Ptolemy Lathurus, the ruler of Cyprus, who himself took possession of the town by force (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 12. 2–6). He was however soon deprived of it by his mother Cleopatra, queen of Egypt (*Antt.* xiii. 13. 1–2). Ptolemais seems never again to have come under the authority of the Seleucidae, nay even the still more northward towns of Tyre and Sidon had meantime made themselves independent. On the contrary, we still find there, about 70 B.C., an Egyptian princess, Selene, daughter of this Cleopatra, and widow of Antiochus Grypus, to whom she had been given in marriage by her mother, when the latter entered into alliance with him against Antiochus Kyzikenos, who ruled in Coele Syria.¹⁵⁸ At the instance of this Selene Ptolemais closed its gates against Tigranes, king of Armenia, the conqueror of the Seleucid kingdom; was thereupon

The title Antiochians was also aspired after by the Hellenistic party in Jerusalem; see 2 Macc. iv. 9, and Grimm (the passage should be translated, “and to enroll the inhabitants of Jerusalem as Antiochians,” or “to receive the inhabitants of Jerusalem into the list of Antiochians”). Whether, and what, privileges were combined therewith can hardly be ascertained.

¹⁵⁷ Gardner, *Catalogue of Greek Coins*, etc., pp. 44, 47, 52. A coin of Trypho is given by De Sauley, *Mélanges de Numism.* vol. ii. 1877, p. 82.

¹⁵⁸ Justin. *Hist.* xxxix. 4. 4

conquered by Tigranes, but again liberated when Tigranes found himself obliged to retreat by reason of the attacks of the Romans upon his own kingdom (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 16. 4). Ptolemais seems to have experienced special favour from Caesar, when in the year 47 he was over the affairs of Syria. For there are in existence some of its coins of the imperial period with an era reaching back to Caesar.¹⁵⁹ Probably the coins with the legend *Πτολεμαι. ιερας και ασυλον* (or the like) belong also to this time (shortly after Caesar).¹⁶⁰ The Emperor Claudius settled a colony of veterans in Ptolemais. Hence the town was henceforth called *colonia Ptolemais*, though it did not possess the actual privileges of a colony.¹⁶¹ At the breaking out of the Jewish war, the Jews in Ptolemais, 2000 in number, were slaughtered by the inhabitants (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 5). The district of Ptolemais is mentioned by Josephus as the western boundary of Galilee (*Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 1; comp. *Vita*, 24). The formula: *Πτολεμαίδα και την προσκυρούσαν αὐτῇ, scil. χώραν* (1 Macc. x. 39), is characteristic.

Next to the great maritime towns, the towns of the so-called *Decapolis* belong to the class of independent Hellenistic communities. The organization alluded to in this word was probably the work of Pompey. For we first meet with the term (ἡ *Δεκάπολις*) during the Roman period;¹⁶² and most

¹⁵⁹ See Eckhel, iii. 425. De Saulcy, pp. 162, 164, 166. Ptolemais was not the only town which was favoured by Caesar; comp. Marquardt, i. 397.

¹⁶⁰ See these especially in De Saulcy, 154–156.

¹⁶¹ Plinius, v. 19, 75: *colonia Claudi Caesaris Ptolemais quae quondam Acee*; comp. xxxvi. 26. 190. *Digest.* lib. xv. 1. 3 (from Ulpianus): *Ptolemaeus enim colonia, quae inter Phoenicien et Palaestinam sita est, nihil praeter nomen coloniae habet* (also Noris, p. 427 sq.). On coins: COL. PTOL., sometimes with the numbers of the vi. ix. x. xi. legions. See in general. Noris, iv. 5. 2 (ed. Lips. pp. 424–430). Eckhel, iii. 423–425. Mionnet, v. 473–481; *Suppl.* viii. 324–331. De Saulcy, pp. 153–169. 405 sq., pl. viii. n. 2–11. The same, *Mélanges de Numismatique*, vol. ii. 1877, pp. 143–146. Zumpt, *Commentat. epigr.* i. 386. Marquardt, i. 428

¹⁶² Matt. iv. 25; Mark v. 20, vii. 31; Plinius, *H. N.* v. 18. 74. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 9. 7; *Vita*, 65, 74. Ptolemaeus, v. 15. 22. *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4501 (inscription of the time of Hadrian). Eusebius, *Onomast.*, ed

of the towns of Decapolis owe their independent political existence to Pompey. These were the Hellenistic towns of the country east of Jordan, which, having been subjected by Alexander Jannaeus, were again liberated from Jewish authority by Pompey. It is probable that they thus formed a kind of confederacy, which originally consisted of ten towns, and was therefore called ἡ Δεκάπολις, but retained the name after the number was enlarged by the accession of other towns. For the number did not always remain the same, as Pliny, our chief authority, remarks, *H. N.* v. 18. 74: Decapolitana regio a numero oppidorum, in quo non omnes eadem observant, plurimum tamen Damascus, Philadelphiam, Raphanam, Scythopolim, Gadara, Hippon, Dion, Pellam, Galasam (read: Gerasam), Canatham. Besides Pliny, only Ptolemy v. 15. 22-23 gives an enumeration of the several towns. It contains all the towns mentioned by Pliny, with the exception of Raphana; and besides these, nine others (situated chiefly in the north of Palestine in the neighbourhood of Damascus), so that the number given by him amounts to eighteen. Hence we must keep to Pliny for the original number. To those named by him, we add only Abila and Kanata (another town than Kanatha), both which have also the Pompeian era. All the towns except Scythopolis lie in the region east of the Jordan. The inclusion of Damascus, lying so far to the north, is striking. Since however it is mentioned by both Pliny and Ptolemy, it must be retained. In any case Decapolis, as such, continued in existence in the second century after Christ (the time of the geographer Ptolemy). Its dissolution took place in the course of the third century, in consequence of the transference of some of its most important towns to the province of Arabia (constituted a province A.D. 105). The mention of Decapolis by later

Lagarde, p. 251. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 29. 7; *de mens. et pond.* § 15. Stephanus Byz. s.v. Γέρασα (the text handed down has here τεσσαρεσκαίδεκαπόλεις, for which however Meineke rightly reads δεκαπόλεις). Comp. in general, Winer, *RWB.*, s.v. "Decapolis." Caspari, *Chronologisch-geographische Einleitung in das Leben Jesu Christi* (1869), pp. 83-90.

authors, as Eusebius, Epiphanius, Steph. Byz., rests therefore only on historical information. The following enumeration is in geographical order from north to south.

12. *Damascus*, *Δαμασκός*, Hebr. דַּמָּשְׁקַיִם. From the varied history of this town, we can here bring forward only such particulars as are important with respect to its constitution during the Hellenistic and Roman periods.¹⁶³ The dominion of Alexander the Great over Damascus is evidenced not only by the narratives of authors, but by coins of Alexander issued there.^{163a} In the third century before Christ, Damascus seems to have belonged not, like Phoenicia and Palestine, to the Ptolemies, but to the Seleucidae. It is true, that when Ptolemy II. seized Phoenicia and Palestine, B.C. 280, he must also have taken possession of Damascus. It was however reconquered by Antiochus I. (280–262).¹⁶⁴ At the great invasion of the realm of the Seleucidae by Ptolemy III., B.C. 246, in which all Syria was for some time lost to Seleucus II., Damascus seems to have been not once conquered, but only besieged. Seleucus relieved it, when in the year 242/241 he again victoriously pressed southwards.¹⁶⁵ The fact, that Damascus anciently formed part of the Seleucid dominions, is

¹⁶³ See in general, Rödiger in Ersch and Gruber's *Encycl.* sect. i. vol. 22, Div. 2, pp. 113–116. Arnold in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* 1st ed. iii. 259–262. Winer, s.v. Nöldeke in Schenkel's *Bibelllex.* s.v. Robinson, *Recent Scriptural Researches*, iii. 442–468. Ritter, *Erdkunde* xvii. 2. 1332 sqq. Kremer, *Topographie von Damascus* (*Records of the Viennese Academy, phil.-hist. Cl.* vol. v. and vi. 1854–55). Porter, *Five Years in Damascus*, 2 vols. 1855. Sepp, *Jerusalem* (2nd ed.), ii. 358–385. Bäder-Socin, *Palästina in Bild und Wort*, vol. i. (1883) pp. 389–442 and 504.

^{163a} Curtius, iii. 13, iv. 1. Arrian, ii. 11. 9 sq., 15. 1. The coins in L. Müller, *Numismatique d'Alexandre le Grand*, p. 287 sq., pl. u. 1338–1346.

¹⁶⁴ Polyæn. iv. 15; comp. Droysen, *Gesch. d. Hellenismus*, iii. 1. 256, 274. Stark, *Gaza*, pp. 366, 367.

¹⁶⁵ Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene, i. 251 (Armenian text according to Petermann's translation): Ptolemaeus autem, qui et Triphon, partes (regiones) Syriorum occupavit: quae vero apud (ad contra) Damaskum et Orthosiam obsessio fiebat, finem accepit (accipiebat) centesimae tricesimae quartae olimpiadis anno tertio, quum Seleukus eo descendisset (descenderit). Olymp. 134, 3 = 242/241 B.C. Comp. Droysen, iii. 1. 390, 393. Stark adopts, according to Zohrab's translation of the Armenian text, the view of an actual taking of Damascus by Ptolemy.

indirectly confirmed by the circumstance, that Polybius, when fully relating the particulars of the conquest of Phœnicia and Palestine by Antiochus the Great (v. 61–71), mentions indeed the taking of the most important Phœnician and Palestinian towns, but nowhere speaks of Damascus. When in 111 B.C. the Syrian kingdom was, in consequence of the strife between the brothers Antiochus VIII. (Grypos) and Antiochus IX. (Kyzikenos), divided, and Antiochus Kyzikenos established himself in the southern part,¹⁶⁶ Damascus probably became the capital of his small kingdom. At all events it was about 95–85 B.C. repeatedly the capital of a kingdom of Coelesyria separated from the kingdom of Syria, first under Demetrius Eukaerus a son of Antiochus Grypos (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 13. 4), then under Antiochus XII. also a son of Grypos (*Antt.* xiii. 15. 1). Antiochus XII. fell in battle against the Arabian king Aretas; and Damascus continued henceforth under his authority (*Antt.* xiv. 15. 1, 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 4. 7, 8). When Pompey penetrated into Asia, Damascus was first of all occupied by his legates (*Antt.* xiv. 2. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 6. 2). Apparently it was not restored to the Arabian king, but united to the province of Syria.¹⁶⁷ In the time of Cassius (44–42 B.C.) we find a Roman commander, Fabius, in Damascus (*Antt.* xiv. 11. 7, 12. 1; *Bell. Jud.* i. 12. 1, 2). Already in the times of Augustus and Tiberius there were Roman imperial coins of Damascus, but at the same time, as in the case of Ascalon, autonomic ones also. The Seleucid era is used on both, and this continued to be the prevailing one at Damascus.¹⁶⁸ There

¹⁶⁶ Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene, i. 260.

¹⁶⁷ Hieronymus, *Comment. in Jesaj.* c. 17 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, iv. 194): Alii aestimant de Romana captivitate prædici, quoniam et Judæorum captus est populus, et Damascus, cui imperabat Areta, similem sustinuit servitutem. I cannot think Marquardt (i. 405) correct in adopting the notion, that the Arabian kings kept possession of Damascus in exchange for the payment of a tribute till A.D. 106.

¹⁶⁸ See on the coins in general, Noris ii. 2. 2 (ed. Lips. pp. 87–93). Eckhel, iii. 329–334. Mionnet, v. 283–297; *Suppl.* viii. 193–206. De Sauley, pp. 30–56, 404, pl. ii. n. 1–10. Kremer, *Die Münzsammlung des Stifts St. Florian* (1871), pp. 167–170, table vi. n. 7, 8.

are no coins of the times of Caligula and Claudius, though there are coins from Nero onwards. With this circumstance must be combined the fact, that Damascus, when St. Paul fled from it (probably in the time of Caligula), was under a viceroy (ἐθνάρχης) of the Arabian king Aretas (2 Cor. xi. 32). Hence it then belonged temporarily to the Arabian king, whether he seized it by violence or obtained it by imperial favour. That there was a Jewish community in Damascus is already evident from the New Testament (Acts ix. 2; 2 Cor. xi. 32). That it was numerous may be inferred from the number of Jews slain at Damascus at the breaking out of the great war. This amounted to 10,000, or according to another statement 18,000 (the former, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 2; the latter, *Bell. Jud.* vii. 8. 7). After Hadrian the town bore the title *μητρόπολις*, after Alexander Severus it was a colony (not first after Philip the Arabian, as even Eckhel supposes), both facts being witnessed to by the coins.¹⁶⁹ We are informed (*Antt.* xviii. 6. 3) of a dispute concerning boundaries between the Damascenes and Sidonians in the time of Tiberius, which is chiefly of interest as showing, how extensive the district pertaining to this town must have been, since it bordered upon that of Sidon.

13. *Hippus*, Ἱππος, is properly the name of a mountain or hill, on which stood the town of the same name.¹⁷⁰ Identical with it is probably the Hebrew Susitha (סוּסִיתָא), which is frequently mentioned in Rabbinical authorities as a Gentile town of Palestine,¹⁷¹ and Susije,^{171a} which frequently occurs in Arabic geographers. The following statements serve to

¹⁶⁹ On the title *μητρόπολις*, see Eckhel, iii. 331. Kuhn, ii. 192. Marquardt, i. 430.

¹⁷⁰ Ptolemaeus, v. 15. 8.

¹⁷¹ In the Tosefta, *Ohaloth* xviii. 4 (ed. Zuckermann, p. 616, 23), Susitha is mentioned together with Ascalon as an example of a heathen town "girt about" by the land of Israel. It is elsewhere frequently named in conjunction with Tiberias. Comp. Lightfoot, *Centuria chronographica Matthaeo praemissa*, c. 77; *de cas Marco praemissa*, c. 5. 1 (*Opp.* ii. 226, 413). Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, pp. 238-240.

^{171a} Clermont-Ganneau, *Où était Hippos de la Décapole?* (*Revue archéol.*

determine the locality. According to Pliny, it stood on the eastern shore of the Lake of Gennesareth;¹⁷² according to Josephus, only 30 stadia from Tiberias;¹⁷³ according to Eusebius and Jerome, near a certain city and castle of Afeka.¹⁷⁴ According to these data the ruins of el-Hösn on a hill on the eastern shore of the Lake of Gennesareth are probably to be regarded as marking the position of the ancient Hippus; a village of the name of Fik, which must be identical with the ancient Afeka, is three-quarters of a league off.¹⁷⁵ The supposed identity of the name Hippos with el-Hösn (the horse) is certainly questionable.^{175a} But little is known of the history of Hippus.¹⁷⁶ It received its freedom from Pompey (Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 7). It was bestowed by Augustus upon Herod (*Antt.* xv. 7. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 20. 3), after whose death it was again separated from the Jewish region (*Antt.* xvii. 11. 4; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 3). On this occasion it is expressly called a Greek city (*l.c.*). At the outbreak of the Jewish revolt the district of Hippus as well as that of Gadara was devastated by the Jews under the leadership of

logique, nouvelle série, vol. xxix. 1875, pp. 362-369). Furrer, *Zeitschr. d. deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, ii. 74.

¹⁷² Plinius, v. 15. 71: in lacum . . . Genesaram . . . amoenis circum-saeptum oppidis, ab oriente Juliade et Hippo.

¹⁷³ Joseph. *Vita*, 65. The statements of Josephus are here indeed very systematic, Hippus 30, Gadara 60, Scythopolis 120 stadia from Tiberias. He is here following the tendency of stating distances as *low* as possible. His figures must therefore be anything but strictly taken. Besides it is clear also from Josephus, that the district of Hippus lay by the lake, opposite Tarichea (*Vita*, 31) in the neighbourhood of Gadara (*Vita*, 9).

¹⁷⁴ Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lag. p. 219. Hieron. *ibid.* p. 91.

¹⁷⁵ The situations of Fik and el-Hösn are already described by Burckhardt, *Reisen in Syrien*, i. 438. That it is here that the ancient Hippus must be sought is the view also of Raumer, p. 250. Ritter, xv. 1. 352 sq. Furrer, *Zeitschr. d. deutschen Pal.-Vereins*, ii. 73 sq. Others identify el-Hösn with Gamala, and find Hippus either in Fik (so Merrill, *East of the Jordan*, 1881, pp. 163-169) or in Sumra, lying far more to the south (so Guérin, *Galilée*, i. 310-312).

^{175a} Clermont-Ganneau (as above, p. 364) explains Hösn as the common pronunciation of Hisn (fortress). The name occurs elsewhere also as an Arabic local name in modern Palestine.

¹⁷⁶ Comp. besides the literature in note 175, Reland, p. 821 sq.

Justus of Tiberias (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1; *Vita*, 9). The inhabitants of Hippus retaliated by slaying or casting into prison all the Jews dwelling in the city (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 5). In Christian times Hippus was the see of a bishop.¹⁷⁷ The name of the town has as yet been only once shown to exist upon coins (viz. on one of Nero's time).^{177a} But coins with the legend *Ἀντιοχέων τῶν πρὸς Ἰπ(πον) τῆς ἱερ(ᾶς) κ(αὶ) ἀσύλου* have been rightly referred by numismatists to Hippus. They have as might be expected the Pompeian era, and on most is the image of a horse.¹⁷⁸—The district of Hippus is mentioned *Vita*, 9, 31; *Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 1. *Vita*, 9: ἐμπύρρησι τὰς τε Γαδαρηνῶν καὶ Ἰππηνῶν κώμας, αἱ δὲ μεθόριοι τῆς Τιβεριάδος καὶ τῆς τῶν Σκυθοπολιτῶν γῆς ἐτύγχανον κείμεναι, is most instructive as showing, that the districts of these four towns were so extensive as to form a connected whole.

14. *Gadara, Γαδará*. The position of Gadara on the site of the present ruins of Om-Keis (Mkês), to the south-east of the Lake of Gennesareth, was recognised by Seetzen so early as 1806, and may now be regarded as settled.¹⁷⁹ The main point of connection is furnished by the warm springs for which Gadara was famous, and which are still found in this region.¹⁸⁰ They lie on the northern bank of the Scheriat

¹⁷⁷ Epiphan. *Haer.* 73, 26. Le Quien, *Oriens christianus*, iii. 710 sq. Hierocles, *Synecd.*, ed. Parthey, p. 44. The *Notit. episcopat.*, the same, p. 144.

^{177a} The coin is given by Muret, *Revue Numismatique*, troisième série, vol. i. 1883, p. 67, and pl. ii. n. 9. It has on one side a head of Nero with the superscription *ΑΥΤ. ΚΑΙΣ.*, on the other a horse with the superscription *ΙΠΠΗΝΩΝ* and the date *ΑΔΡ* (131), the latter according to the Pompeian era.

¹⁷⁸ Noris, iii. 9. 5 (ed. Lips. pp. 331–334). Eckhel, iii. 346 sq. Mionnet, v. 319 sq.; *Suppl.* viii. 224. De Saulcy, pp. 344–347, pl. xix. n. 10–15.

¹⁷⁹ Seetzen, *Reisen durch Syrien* (ed. by Kruse, 4 vols. 1854–59), i. 368 sqq., iv. 188 sqq. Burckhardt, *Reisen in Syrien*, i. 426 sqq., 434 sqq., 537 sq. (who indeed takes Om-Keis for Gamala, but is corrected by his editor Gesenius). Buckingham, *Travels in Palestine*, 1821, pp. 414–440 (like Burckhardt). Winer, *s.v.* "Gadara." Raumer, p. 248 sq. Ritter, xv. 1. 371–384, xv. 2. 1052 sq. Sepp, *Jerusalem*, ii. 211–216. Bäder-Socin, p. 415 sq. Guérin, *Galilée*, i. 299–308. Merrill, *East of the Jordan* (1881), pp. 145–158. For the history, Reland, pp. 773–778. Kuhn, ii. 365 sq., 371.

¹⁸⁰ Comp. on the situation, Euseb. *Onomast.* p. 248: Γάδαραι, πόλις ὑπὲρ

el-Mandur; on the southern bank, at about a league's distance from the springs, are found on the lofty ridge of the hill the ruins of the town. Hence the Scheriat el-Mandur is identical with the Hieromices, which according to Pliny flowed past the town.¹⁸¹ Gadara was in the time of Antiochus the Great already an important fortress. It was conquered by Antiochus both at his first invasion (B.C. 218),¹⁸² and when he finally took possession of Palestine after his victory at Panias, B.C. 198.¹⁸³ It was taken by Alexander Jannaeus after a ten months' siege (*Antt.* xiii. 13. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 4. 2). It consequently belonged under him and his successors to the Jewish region (*Antt.* xiii. 15. 4), but was separated from it by Pompey (*Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 7). On this occasion Pompey, out of regard for his freedman Demetrius of Gadara, rebuilt the city, which had been destroyed by the Jews (Alexander Jannaeus?). Hence upon the numerous coins of the town extending from Augustus to Gordian, the Pompeian era is used. It begins in the year

τὸν Ἰορδάνην, ἀντικρὺ Σκυθοπόλεως καὶ Τιβεριάδος πρὸς ἀνατολὰς ἐν τῷ ὄρει, οὗ πρὸς ταῖς ὑπαρεΐαις τὰ τῶν θερμῶν ὑδάτων λουτρά παρὰ κεῖται. *Ibid.* p. 219: Αἰμάθ . . . κάμη πλησίον Γαδάρων, ἣ ἐστὶν Ἑμμαθαῖ, ἔνθα τὰ τῶν θερμῶν ὑδάτων θερμὰ λουτρά. On the baths, see also especially the passages from Epiphanius, Antoninus Martyr and Eunapius (who declares them to have been the most important after those of Baiae), in Reland, p. 775. Also Origenes in *Joann.* vol. vi. c. 24 (ed. Lommatsch, i. 239): Γάδαρα γὰρ πόλις μὲν ἐστὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, περὶ ἣν τὰ διαβόητα θερμὰ τυγχάνει. The place where the springs are situated occurs in the Talmud under the name *המנה*. See the passages in Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterbuch*, ii. 69 sq. Lightfoot, *Centuria Matthaeo praemissa*, c. 74 (Opp. ii. 224 sq.). Hamburger, *Real-Encyclop. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. art. "Heilbäder." Grätz, *Monatschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1880, pp. 487-495.

¹⁸¹ Plinius, v. 18. 74: Gadara Hieromice praefluente. The form Hieromax, which still appears in handbooks, is derived from the incorrect reading Hieromace. That Hieromices must be adopted as the nominative is proved by the occurrence elsewhere of the forms Hieromicas (*Tab. Peut.*) and Jeromisus (*Geogr. Ravennas*, ed. Pinder et Parthey, p. 85). The native name is Jarmuk, *יַרְמֻק*, Mishna, *Para* viii. 10, and Arabic geographers (see Arnold in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* 1st ed. vii. 10, xi. 20).

¹⁸² Polyb. v. 71. Stark, *Gaza*, p. 381. Polybius says of Gadara on this occasion: αἱ δοκεῖ τῶν κατ' ἐκείνους τοὺς τόπους ὀχυρότητι διαφέρειν.

¹⁸³ Polyb. xvi. 39 = Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 3. 3. Stark, p. 403.

690 A.U.C., so that 1 *aer. Gadara*. = 64/63 B.C.¹⁸⁴ The memory of its rebuilding by Pompey is also perpetuated upon coins from Antoninus Pius to Gordianus by the legend *Πομπηϊέων Γαδαρέων*.¹⁸⁵ The notion that Gadara was the seat of one of the five Jewish Sanhedrin established by Gabinius is incorrect (see above, § 13). In the year 30 B.C., Gadara was bestowed upon Herod by Augustus (*Antt.* xv. 7. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 20. 3). The town was however very discontented with his government. So early as the year 23–31 B.C., when M. Agrippa was staying at Mytilene, certain Gadarenes there brought complaint against Herod (*Antt.* xv. 10. 2). Complaints were repeated when Augustus in the year 20 personally visited Syria (*Antt.* xv. 10. 3). In both cases those who made them were dismissed. It is quite in accordance with this, that we find Gadarene coins of just the year 20 B.C. (44 *aer. Gadara*.) with the image of Augustus and the inscription *Σεβαστός*—Herod being desirous, by stamping such coins at Gadara, to show his gratitude to the emperor.¹⁸⁶ After the death of Herod, Gadara regained its independence under Roman supremacy (*Antt.* xvii. 11. 4; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 3). At the beginning of the Jewish revolt the district of Gadara, like that of the neighbouring Hippus, was devastated by the Jews under the leadership of Justus of Tiberias (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1; *Vita*, 9). The Gadarenes, like their neighbours of Hippus, avenged themselves by slaying or imprisoning the Jews dwelling in their town (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 5). Such of the inhabitants however as were friendly to the Romans, not feeling themselves secure against the turbulent

¹⁸⁴ On the era and the coins, see Noris, iii. 9. 1 (ed. Lips. pp. 297–308). Eckhel, iii. 348–350. Mionnet, v. 323–328; *Suppl.* viii. 227–230. De Saulcy, pp. 294–303, pl. 15. Kenner, *Die Münzesammlung des Stifts St. Florian* (1871), p. 171 sq., Taf. vi. n. 10.

¹⁸⁵ As the legend is generally abbreviated (*Πο.* or *Πομπ.* *Γαδαρεων*), the reading is not quite certain. The older numismatics give for a coin of Caracalla the reading *Πομπηϊτεων Γαδαρεων*; De Saulcy, on the contrary (p. 302, and pl. xv. n. 9), gives *Πομπηϊεων Γαδαρεων*, which is certainly correct.

¹⁸⁶ Comp. De Saulcy, p. 295. The coins in Mionnet, v. 323; *Suppl.* viii. 227.

elements in their own city, requested and received a Roman garrison from Vespasian in the later period of the war (*Bell. Jud.* iv. 7. 3, 4).¹⁸⁷ In what sense Josephus can designate Gadara as the *μητρόπολις τῆς Περαιάς* (*Bell. Jud.* iv. 7. 3) cannot be further ascertained.¹⁸⁸ On coins, especially of the time of the Antonines, it is called *ιε(ρὰ) ἄσ(υλος) α(ὐτόνομος) γ(. . ?) Κοί(λης) Συρ(ίας)*.¹⁸⁹ According to an inscription discovered by Renan, it was during the later imperial period a Roman colony.¹⁹⁰ The information of Stephanus Byz. (*s.v.*), that it was also called *Ἀντιόχεια* and *Σελεύκεια*, stands quite alone, and certainly refers only to temporary official designations, not to such as had come into common use. There is abundant evidence that it was already in pre-Christian times a flourishing Hellenistic town. Josephus calls it at the death of Herod a *πόλις Ἑλληνίς* (*Antt.* xvii. 11. 4; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 3); Strabo mentions as renowned natives of Gadara, Philodemus the Epicurean, the poet Meleager, and Menippus the Cynic, who on account of his witty style was often called *ὁ σπουδογελοῖος*, and Theodorus the orator.¹⁹¹ Of later times must also be added Oenomaus, the cynic and the orator

¹⁸⁷ From Joseph. *Vita*, 15, it might appear as though Josephus also, as ruler of Galilee, had once taken possession of Gadara by force. But the reading there should certainly be *Γαβαρεῖς*, instead of *Γαδάρεις*; comp. *Vita*, 25, 45, 47. In *Bell. Jud.* iii. 7. 1, also *Γαβαρέων* must be read for *Γαδαρέων*. Lastly, in *Antt.* xiii. 13. 5, either the reading is corrupt or another Gadara is meant.

¹⁸⁸ Eckhel (iii. 349) supposes that it was the place of assembly of some association for the celebration of periodical games, in which sense the word *μητρόπολις* is certainly often used.

¹⁸⁹ See in De Saulcy especially the coins of Commodus, n. 2 (p. 301), and Elagabalus, n. 5 (p. 303). The predicate *ιερα* is also found in an epigram of Meleager, where he says of himself: *ὃν θεόπαις ἠνδρώσε Τύρος, Γαδάρων θ' ἱερὰ χθών* (*Anthologia palatina*, vii. 419, ed. Jacobs, vol. i. p. 431). Gadara is also designated by Steph. Byz. as *πόλις Κοίλης Συρίας*.

¹⁹⁰ Renan, *Mission de Phénicie*, p. 191 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. iii. n. 181 (epitaph at Byblus): *col(onia) Valen(tia) Gadara*.

¹⁹¹ Strabo, xvi. p. 759. Strabo indeed frequently confuses our Gadara with Gadaza = Gadara. That the latter cannot be regarded as the native place of these men is self-evident. The individuals in question are all known to us elsewhere (see above, p. 29). The orator Theodorus was the tutor of the Emperor Tiberius (Sueton. *Tiber.* 57), and afterwards lived at Rhodes,

Apsines.¹⁹² Meleager says of himself that he came of "an Attic race, dwelling in Assyrian Gadara."¹⁹³ The district of Gadara formed the eastern boundary of Galilee (*Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 1). On its extent, comp. *Vita*, 9, and above, p. 100. That it reached to the Lake of Gennesareth may not only be inferred from Matt. viii. 28 (where the reading is uncertain), but also from the coins, on which a ship is often portrayed, nay once (on a coin of Marc. Aurel.) a ναυμα(χία) mentioned.¹⁹⁴

15. *Abila*, Ἀβίλα. The local name Abel (אֶבֶל) or Abila is very frequent in Palestine. Eusebius knows of three places of this name celebrated for the cultivation of the vine: (1) A village in South Peraea, 6 *mil. pass.* from Philadelphia; (2) A πόλις ἐπίσημος, 12 *mil. pass.* from Gadara; (3) A place between Damascus and Paneas.¹⁹⁵ Of these the second town on the east of Gadara is the one with which we are here concerned. Its situation, on the south bank of the Scheriat el-Mandur, was discovered, as well as that of Gadara, by Seetzen.¹⁹⁶ Pliny does not mention this Abila among the cities of Decapolis. Its inclusion among them is however evidenced by an inscription of the time of Hadrian.¹⁹⁷ An where Tiberius frequently visited him during his exile (Pauly's *Enc.* vi 2, 1819).

¹⁹² Reland, p. 775.

¹⁹³ *Anthologia palatina*, vii. 417, ed. Jacobs, vol. i. p. 430 (ed. Dübner, i. 352, where however, without reason, Γαδάροις is changed into Γάδαρα):

Νᾶσος ἐμὰ θρέπτειρα Τύρος· πάτρα δὲ με τεκνοῖ
 Ατθίς ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις ναιομένα Γαδάροις.

¹⁹⁴ On the latter, comp. especially Eckhel, iii. 348 sq. A ship is seen in the illustrations in De Saulcy, pl. xv. n. 9-11.

¹⁹⁵ Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Legarde, p. 225: "Ἀβελ ἀμπέλων. ἔνθα ἐπολέμησεν Ἰεφθάε. γῆς υἱὸν Ἀμμών, ἣ ἐστὶν εἰς ἔτι νῦν κάμη ἀμπελοφόρος" Ἀβελ ἀπὸ τῶν σημείων Φιλαδελφίας. καὶ ἄλλη πόλις ἐπίσημος Ἀβελὰ οἰνοφόρος καλουμένη, διεσπᾶσα Γαδάρων σημείοις ἐβ' πρὸς ἀνατολάς. καὶ τρίτη τις αὐτῇ Ἀβελὰ τῆς Φοινίκης μεταξὺ Δαμασκοῦ καὶ Πανιᾶδος.

¹⁹⁶ Seetzen, *Reisen durch Syrien* (edited by Kruse), i. 371, iv. 190 sq. Comp. also Burckhardt, *Reisen in Syrien*, i. 425, 537. Raumer, p. 241. Ritter, xv. 2. 1058-1060. On the history, Reland, p. 525 sq. Kuhn, ii. 335, 371 sq.

¹⁹⁷ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4501 (inscription of Palmyra of the year 445 aer. Sel.=133-134 A.D.): Ἀγαθάγγελος Ἀβιληνὸς τῆς Δεκαπόλεως.

Ἀβίδα by which our *Ἀβίλα* is certainly intended is also placed by Ptolemy among the cities of Decapolis.¹⁹⁸ It first appears in history in the time of Antiochus the Great, who occupied Abila as well as its neighbour Gadara at both his first and his second conquest of Palestine, 219 and 198 B.C.¹⁹⁹ On the whole it seems to have frequently shared the lot of Gadara. Like the latter, Abila received its liberty through Pompey. For the coins of Abila with the Pompeian era are rightly ascribed to this town.²⁰⁰ Its titles also are the same as those of Gadara: *ἡ(ερά) ἄ(συλος) α(ὐτόνομος) γ(. . . ?) Κοί(λης) Συ(ροίας)*. The coins show that the town was also called *Σελεύκεια*, the inhabitants were called *Σελευκ(εῖς) Ἀβιληνοί*.²⁰¹ In Nero's time Abila was given to Agrippa II., unless the notice of Josephus to that effect rests upon an error.²⁰² In the sixth century after Christ Christian bishops of Abila, who may with tolerable certainty be referred to our Abila, are mentioned.²⁰³

16. *Raphana*, not to be confounded with the Syrian *Ῥαφά-*

¹⁹⁸ Ptolem. v. 15. 22. The Codex of Vatopedi also has here *Ἀβίδα*; see *Géographie de Ptolémée, reproduction photolithogr. du manuscrit grec du monastère de Vatopédi* (Paris 1867), p. lvii. line 4.

¹⁹⁹ Polyb. v. 71 and xvi. 39 = Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 3. 3.

²⁰⁰ See on these, especially Belley in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, ancient series, vol. xxviii. 1761, pp. 557-567. Eckhel, iii. 345 sq. Mionnet, v. 318; *Suppl.* viii. 223 sq. De Sauley, pp. 308-312, pl. xvi. n. 1-7.

²⁰¹ This is now confirmed by a coin of Faustina, jun., given by De Sauley (p. 310, and pl. xvi. n. 2). The coins formerly known give either the abbreviated *Σε. Αβιληνων* or (a damaged one of Faustina) . . . *λευκ. Αβιλας*, the former of which was completed as *Σεβαστων*, the latter as *Λευκαδος*, both erroneously, as is now shown.

²⁰² *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13. 2. In the parallel passage, *Antt.* xx. 8. 2, Josephus says nothing of it; and it is striking that Abila should not (like the other towns there named: Julias-Bethsaida, Tarichea, Tiberias) be connected with the rest of Agrippa's dominions. Besides *Antt.* xii. 3. 3 and *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13. 2 are the only passages in which our Abila is mentioned by Josephus. For in *Antt.* iv. 8. 1, v. 1. 1, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 7. 6, another Abila, near the Jordan, and opposite Jericho, not far from Julias-Livias, and not identical with either of the three places of the same name mentioned by Eusebius, is meant. Again, the well-known Abila Lysaniae is different. Nor is the list by any means thereby exhausted. See Winer, *RWB.*, s.v. "Abila."

²⁰³ Le Quien, *Oriens christianus*, iii. 702 sq. Comp. Hierocles, *Synecd.*, ed. Parthey, p. 44. *Notit. episcopat.*, the same, p. 144.

veia in Cassiotis, is mentioned only by Pliny (v. 18. 74).²⁰⁴ The *Ῥαφών* however of the first Book of the Maccabees (v. 37 = Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 8. 4), which, according to the context of the narrative (comp. v. 43) lay in the neighbourhood of Astaroth-Karnaim, and therefore in Batanaea, is probably identical with it. Since Ptolemy has not the name of Raphana among the towns of Decapolis, it is probable that he mentions the town by another name; and it is at least possible, though only possible, that Raphana is, as Quandt supposes, identical with the *Capitolias* mentioned by Ptolemy (v. 15. 22), and so frequently elsewhere since the second century after Christ.²⁰⁵

17. *Kanata*. The existence of this town, as distinct from Kanatha, has but recently been ascertained on the ground of inscriptions by Waddington.²⁰⁶ Upon an inscription at el-Afine (on the south-western declivity of the Hauran, to the west of

²⁰⁴ On the Syrian Raphaneia, see Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 1. 3, 5. 1. Ptolem. v. 15. 16. *Tab. Peut.* Hierocles, ed. Parthey, p. 61. Steph. Byz. s.v. Eckhel, iii. 323. Mionnet, v. 268; *Suppl.* viii. 168. Pauly's *Encycl. s.v.* Ritter, xvii. 1. 940 sq.

²⁰⁵ Quandt, *Judäa und die Nachbarschaft im Jahr. vor und nach der Geburt Christi* (1873), p. 40 sq. Capitolias was (according to *Tab. Peut.*) 16 m. p. from Adraa. Since then Raphana was in the neighbourhood of Astaroth-Karnaim, and the latter (according to Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lag. p. 213) 6 m. p. distant from Adraa, Capitolias and Raphana may in fact be identical. The situation of almost all these places is indeed not yet certainly determined. It seems to me incorrect to seek Capitolias, as is frequently done, to the south-east of Gadara. For, according to the *Itinerarium Antonini* (ed. Parthey et Pinder, pp. 88, 89), it lay on the direct route from Gadara to Damascus, and therefore to the north-east of the former. With this agree also the astronomical definitions of Ptolemy (north-east of Gadara, under the same geographical latitude as Hippus). The roadway too given in the *Peutinger Table*, Gadara-Capitolias-Adraa-Bostra, has therefore not a south-eastern, but a north-eastern direction. On the whole Raumer is correct, although his more particular determination of the locality is very problematical. Compare on *Capitolias* in general, Noris, iii. 9. 4 (ed. Lips. pp. 323-331). Eckhel, 328 sq. Mionnet, v. 281-283; *Suppl.* viii. 192. De Sauley, pp. 304-307, pl. xvi. n. 9. Reland, p. 693 sq. Ritter, xv. 356, 821, 1060. Raumer, p. 246. Seetzen, *Reisen* (edited by Kruse), iv. 185 sqq. Kuhn, ii. 372. Le Quien, *Oriens christ.* iii. 715 sq.

²⁰⁶ Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscriptions grecques et latines*, vol. iii., descriptions of n. 2296, 2329, and 2412a. Comp. also Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. 395, note 17.

Hebran) is mentioned an ἀγωγὸς ὑδάτων εἰσφερομένων εἰς **Κάνατα** built by Cornelius Palma, governor of Syria in the time of Trajan.²⁰⁷ This Kanata cannot be identical with Kanatha = Kanawat, for the latter, lying higher than el-Afine, and being itself abundantly supplied with water, an aqueduct from el-Afine thither is inconceivable. The situation of Kanata is however also determined by an inscription discovered by Wetzstein at Kerak (in the plain west-south-west of Kanawat): *Διτ̄ μεγίστ[φ] Κανατηνῶν ὁ [δῆμος]*.²⁰⁸ According to this Kanata is identical with the present Kerak, to whose former Greek culture other inscriptions also bear testimony.²⁰⁹ The few coins of Kanata, which were by former numismatists wrongly attributed to the better known Kanatha, prove at least that Kanata had the Pompeian era, and therefore very probably belonged to Decapolis.²¹⁰ The coins belong to the times of Claudius and Domitian.²¹¹ That Kerak was once a town is confirmed by the mention of a βουλευτής upon an inscription.²¹² On the other hand, another inscription of the middle of the third century after Christ calls it a κώμη.²¹³ It had thus already lost the rights of a town. The date on this inscription is according to the era of the province of Arabia, hence we may conclude, that at the establishment of this province (105 B.C.) it was allotted to it.

²⁰⁷ Le Bas et Waddington, vol. iii. n. 2296.

²⁰⁸ Wetzstein, *Ausgewählte griechische und lateinische Inschriften* (*Transactions of the Berlin Academy*, 1863, *philol.-histor. Cl.*), n. 185 = Waddington, n. 2412d.

²⁰⁹ Wetzstein, n. 183–186 = Waddington, n. 2412d–2412g.

²¹⁰ Belley in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscr. et Belles-Lettres*, ancient series, vol. xxviii. 568 sqq. Eckhel, iii. 347. Mionnet, v. 231; *Suppl.* viii. 225. De Saulcy, p. 339 sq., pl. xxiii. n. 8, 9. Reichardt in the *Wiener Numismat. Zeitsch.* 1880, pp. 68–73. De Saulcy and Reichardt were the first to distinguish correctly the coins of Kanata and Kanatha. Among the older numismatians are also other mistakes.

²¹¹ Mionnet, *Suppl.* viii. 225, gives a coin of Maximinus, which however does not belong to Kanata, but to Ascalon (see De Saulcy, p. 208). De Saulcy and Reichardt give each a coin of Elagabalus, the reading of which is however very uncertain.

²¹² Wetzstein, n. 184 = Waddington, n. 2412e.

²¹³ Wetzstein, n. 186 = Waddington, n. 2412f.

18. *Kanatha*. On the western declivity of the Hauran range is the place now called *Kanawat*, whose ruins are among the most important of the country east of the Jordan. Numerous inscriptions, well preserved remains of temples and other public buildings, prove that an important town once stood here; and both ruins and inscriptions point to the first centuries of the Roman imperial period. The ruins have, since Seetzen's first hasty visit, been frequently described.²¹⁴ The inscriptions have been most completely collected by Waddington.²¹⁵ It is rightly and almost universally admitted, that the *Kanatha* so often mentioned by ancient authors, and with which the Old Testament קנֶזֶ (Num. xxxii. 42; 1 Chron. ii. 23) is probably identical, is to be sought for here.²¹⁶ The form of the name fluctuates between *Kánaθa* and *Kánwθa*; *Κεναθηνός* also occurs upon an inscription.²¹⁷ Apart from the Old Testament passages, the history of *Kanatha* cannot

²¹⁴ Seetzen, *Reisen durch Syrien* (edited by Kruse), i. 78 sqq., iv. 40, 51 sqq. Burckhardt, *Reisen in Syrien*, i. 157 sqq., 504 sq. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv. 2. 931-939. Porter, *Five Years in Damascus*, 1855, ii. 89-115 (with plan). Bäder-Socin, *Palästina*, p. 433 sqq. (with plan). Merrill, *East of the Jordan* (1881), pp. 36-42. Views of the ruins in Laborde, *Voyage en Orient*, Paris (1837-1845), livraison 21, 22, 26; and in Rey, *Voyage dans le Haouran et aux bords de la mer morte exécuté pendant les années 1857 et 1858*, Paris. Atlas, pl. v.-viii. (pl. vi. plan).

²¹⁵ Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscriptions*, vol. iii. n. 2329-2363. Older information in *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 4612-4615. Wetzstein, *Ausgewählte Inschriften* (*Transactions of the Berlin Academy*, 1863), n. 188-193.

²¹⁶ The identity of *Kanatha* with the present *Kanawat* is best proved in Porter's *Five Years in Damascus*, ii. 110 sqq. The statements in Eusebius and the *Tab. Peut.* are especially convincing. Compare also for the history, Reland, pp. 681 sq., 689. Winer, *RWB.*, s.v. "Kenath." Raumer, p. 252. Ritter, as above. Kuhn, ii. 385 sq. Waddington's explanations on n. 2329.

²¹⁷ The form *Kanatha* is found in Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* i. 19. 2), Plinius (v. 18. 74), Ptolemaeus (v. 15. 23), Stephanus Byz. (*Lex. s.v.*), Eusebius (*Onomast.*, ed. Lag. p. 269); on coins (see the next note), inscriptions (*Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4613: *Καναθηνῶν ἡ πόλις*; Waddington, n. 2216: *Καναθηνός βουλευτής*; Renier, *Inscr. de l'Algérie*, n. 1534 and 1535 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. viii. n. 2394, 2395: cohors prima Flavia Canathenorum); also the *Tabula Peut.* (*Chanata*). The form *Kanotha* is found in Hierocles, ed. Parthey, p. 46 (*Κανοθα*); a *Notitia episcopat.*, the same, p. 92 (*Κανοθάς*); the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon in Le Quien, *Oriens christianus*, ii. 867 (gen. *Κανώθας*); an inscription in the *Bullettino dell' Istituto di corrisp. archeol.*

be traced farther back than the time of Pompey; its coins have the Pompeian era,²¹⁸ and it is reckoned by both Pliny (v. 18. 74) and Ptolemy (v. 15. 23) among the towns of Decapolis. On the coins of Commodus given by Reichardt the inhabitants are called *Γαβειν(ιείς) Καναθ(ηνοί)*; the town therefore seems to have been restored by Gabinius. Herod experienced a mortifying defeat at Kanatha in a battle against the Arabians.²¹⁹ On the civic constitution of Kanatha in imperial times we get some information from inscriptions, *βουλευταί* being frequently mentioned,²²⁰ and once an *ἀγοράνομος*.²²¹ A Graeco-Latin epitaph of a Syrian merchant, discovered in 1862 in the neighbourhood of Trevoux in France, is of special interest. He is designated in the Greek text as *βουλευτῆς πολίτης τε Κανωθαί[ω]ν ἐ[. . .] Συρίας*, in the Latin as *decurio Septimianus Canotha*.²²² What the latter title denotes is indeed very doubtful.²²³ If the *Συρία* of the Greek text is to be understood in the strict sense of the *province* of Syria, it follows from the combination of the two texts, that Kanatha belonged to the province of Syria down to the time of Septimius Severus.^{223a} In the time of Eusebius it belonged to the province of Arabia. It is striking that Eusebius calls

1867, p. 204 (*βουλευτῆς πολίτης τε Κανωθαί[ω]ν*). Lastly, *Καναθηνός* in Waddington, n. 2343. On the present form of the name *Kanawat*, see Wetzstein, *Reisebericht über Hauran und die Trachonen* (1860), p. 77 sq.

²¹⁸ See De Saulcy, pp. 399–401, pl. xxiii. n. 10; and especially Reichardt, *Die Münzen Kanatha's* (*Wiener Numismat. Zeitschr.* 1880, pp. 68–72).

²¹⁹ *Bell. Jud.* i. 19. 2. In the parallel passage, *Antt.* xv. 5. 1, the place is called *Κανά*.

²²⁰ Waddington, n. 2216, 2339 (= Wetzstein, n. 188). *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4613 (= Waddington, n. 2331a). The last-named inscription was discovered by Seetzen, not in Kanawat (as is erroneously stated in the *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* and in Waddington), but in Deir el-Chlef; see Kruse in his edition of Seetzen's *Travels*, iv. 40, note.

²²¹ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 4912 = Waddington, n. 2330.

²²² The inscription is given by Henzen in the *Bullettino dell' Istituto di corrisp. archeol.* 1867, pp. 203–207.

²²³ See Henzen as above, and Waddington's explanations on 2329.

^{223a} So also Waddington on n. 2329, and Marquardt, i. 396. Still Marquardt is inclined, by reason of the circumstances of the garrison, to the view that Kanatha was, in the time of Caracalla, already united to the province of Arabia; see p. 433, note 3.

it a *κώμη*.²²⁴ Could it in his time have no longer had a civic constitution? ^{224a} A Christian bishop of Kanotha was present at the Councils of Ephesus (A.D. 449), Chalcedon (A.D. 451) and Constantinople (A.D. 459).²²⁵

19. *Scythopolis*, *Σκυθόπολις*, one of the most important Hellenistic towns of Palestine, the only one among the towns of Decapolis which lay westward of the Jordan.²²⁶ The ancient name of the town was Beth-sean, *בֵּית שֵׁן* or *שֵׁן בֵּית*, in the Septuagint and in the first Book of Maccabees (v. 52, xii. 40 sq.), *Βαιθσαν*.²²⁷ The ancient name was always maintained beside the Greek one,²²⁸ nay at last supplanted it. To this very day the desolate ruins of Beisan in the valley of the Jordan south of the Lake of Gennesareth mark the position of the ancient city. The name *Σκυθόπολις* is undoubtedly equal to *Σκυθῶν πόλις*, as indeed it is frequently written.²²⁹ The reason for this name is very obscure, probably it must be explained as by Syncellus, by the fact that a number of Scythians settled here on the occasion of their

²²⁴ Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lagarde, p. 269: *Κανάθ. κώμη τῆς Ἀραβίας εἰς ἔτι Καναθὰ λεγομένη . . . κείται δὲ καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐν Τραχῶνι πλησίον Βοστράων.*

^{224a} The statements of Eusebius are not quite trustworthy. He calls *e.g.* Jabis at one time *πόλις* (p. 225), at another *κώμη* (p. 268).

²²⁵ Le Quien, *Oriens christ.* ii. 867.

²²⁶ See in general, Reland, pp. 992–998. Winer, *s.v.* “Beth-sean.” Raumer, p. 150 sq. Pauly’s *Enc.* vi. 1. 729. Robinson, *Palestine*, iii. 326–332. Ritter, xv. 1. 426–435. Kuhn, ii. 371. Guérin, *Samarie*, i. 284–299. *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, ii. 83, 101–114 (with plans); also sheet ix. of the large English chart.

²²⁷ In the Old Test., Josh. xvii. 11, 16; Judg. i. 27; 1 Sam. xxxi. 10, 12; 2 Sam. xxi. 12; 1 Kings iv. 12; 1 Chron. vii. 29. On the identity of Beth-sean and Scythopolis, see Joseph. *Antt.* v. 1. 22, vi. 14. 8, xii. 8. 5, xiii. 6. 1. The gloss of the LXX. on Judg. i. 27. Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lag. p. 237. Steph. Byz. (see next note).

²²⁸ *בֵּית שֵׁן* in the Mishna, *Aboda sara* i. 4, iv. 12. The adj. *בֵּית שֵׁנִי*, *Pea* viii. 1. Comp. Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, p. 174 sq. Steph. Byz. *s.v.* *Σκυθόπολις*, *Παλαιστίνης πόλις ἡ Νύσσης* (l. *Νύσσα*) *Κοίλῃς Συρίας*, *Σκυθῶν πόλις*, *πρότερον Βαίσεων λεγόμενη ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων*. The form Beisan is contracted from Beth-sean.

²²⁹ *Σκυθῶν πόλις*, Judith iii. 11; 2 Macc. xii. 29; LXX. Judg. i. 27. Polybius, v. 70. Aristides, ed. Dindorf, ii. 470.

great invasion of Palestine in the seventh century before Christ.²³⁰ On the name Nysa, which Scythopolis also bore according to Pliny, Stephanus Byz., and which is found upon coins, see above, p. 20. The town was perhaps already known by its Greek name Scythopolis in the time of Alexander the Great, or at any rate in the third century before Christ, when it was tributary to the Ptolemies.²³¹ When in 218 B.C. Antiochus the Great invaded Palestine, the town willingly (*καθ' ὁμολογίαν*) surrendered to him.²³² Like the rest of Palestine however it did not come permanently under Syrian dominion till twenty years later (198 B.C.). In the time of the Maccabees Scythopolis is mentioned as a heathen town, but not as one hostile to the Jews (2 Macc. xii. 29–31). Towards the end of the second century (about 107 B.C.) it came under Jewish rule, the weak Antiochus IX. (Kyzikenos) being unable to offer effectual resistance to the advance of John Hyrcanus, nay his general Epicrates treacherously surrendering Scythopolis to the Jews (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 10. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 2. 7 speaks otherwise).²³³ Hence

²³⁰ Syncell. ed. Dindorf, i. 405: *Σκύθαι τὴν Παλαιστίνην κατέδραμον καὶ τὴν Βασιάν (l. Βαισάν) κατέσχον τὴν ἐξ αὐτῶν κληθεῖσαν Σκυθόπολιν*. On the invasion of the Scythians, see especially Herodotus, i. 105. Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene, ii. 88 sq. Pliny too and his successor Solinus derive the name from the Scythians, but indeed from those whom the god Dionysius settled there for the protection of the grave of his nurse: Plinius, v. 18. 74: *Scythopolim, antea Nysam, a Libero Patre sepulta nutrice ibi Scythi deductis*. Solinus (ed. Mommsen), c. 36: *Liber Pater cum humo nutricem tradidisset, condidit hoc oppidum, ut sepulturae titulum etiam urbis moenibus ampliaret*. Incolae deerant: e comitibus suis Scythas delegit, quos ut animi firmaret ad promptam resistendi violentiam, praemium loci nomen dedit. For another and equally mythological derivation from the Scythians, see Malalas, ed. Dindorf, p. 140, and Cedrenus, ed. Bekker, i. 237. In general Steph. Byz. also explains the name by *Σκυθῶν πόλις* (see note 228). The derivation from Sukkoth is obviated by the fact, that the Hebrew name of the town is not Sukkoth but Beth-sean.

²³¹ Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 4. 5. Comp. above, p. 53. It would be a more ancient testimony to the use of the Greek name, if the reference of the letters Σκ on certain coins of Alexander the Great to Scythopolis were certain. See L. Müller, *Numismatique d'Alexandre le Grand*, p. 304, planches, n. 1429, 1464

²³² Polyb. v. 70. Stark, *Gaza*, p. 381.

²³³ On the chronology, comp. above, § 8.

we find it also in the possession of Alexander Jannaeus (*Antt.* xiii. 15. 4). It was again separated from the Jewish region by Pompey (*Antt.* xiv. 5. 3, xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 7), and restored by Gabinius (*Antt.* xiv. 5. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 8. 4). It afterwards continued to be an independent town under Roman supremacy. Nor did either Herod or his successors ever possess the town. Its membership among the cities of Decapolis is testified by Josephus, who calls it "one of the largest towns of Decapolis" (*Bell. Jud.* iii. 9. 7: ἡ δέ ἐστι μέγιστη τῆς Δεκαπόλεως). It is not quite certain what era it made use of. The Pompeian era is evidently used on a coin of Gordianus; while upon others a later one seems adopted. The titles of the town, especially upon the coins of Gordianus, are *ἱερὰ ἄσυλος*.²³⁴ At the beginning of the Jewish war, A.D. 66, the revolted Jews attacked the district of Scythopolis (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1). The Jewish inhabitants found themselves obliged, for the sake of safety, to fight on the side of the heathen against their fellow-countrymen, who were attacking the town. The heathen inhabitants however afterwards requited this alliance by faithless treachery, luring them into the sacred grove, and then surprising them by night and massacring them to the number, as it is said, of 13,000 (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 3, 4, vii. 8. 7; *Vita*, 6). When Josephus says with respect to the period of the Jewish war, that Scythopolis was then obedient to King Agrippa (*Vita*, 65, ed. Bekker, p. 341, 20: τῆς ὑπηκόου βασιλεῖ), this is certainly not to be understood in the sense of actual subjection, but only means, that Scythopolis was on the side of Agrippa and the Romans.²³⁵ The district of Scythopolis

²³⁴ See on the coins and the era, Belley in the *Mémoires des Inscr. et Belles-Lettres*, ancient series, vol. xxvi. 1759, pp. 415-428. Eckhel, iii. 438-440. Mionnet, v. 511 sq.; *Suppl.* viii. 355 sq. De Saulcy, pp. 287-290, pl. xiv. n. 8-13.

²³⁵ This is all that Josephus is in the context concerned with. It is highly improbable that Scythopolis really belonged (as Menke in his *Bibel-Atlas* supposes) to the dominions of Agrippa, since Josephus in the passages in which he is describing accurately the realm of Agrippa does not mention it.

must be regarded as very extensive. At the taking of Scythopolis and Philoteria (a town of that name on the Lake of Genesareth of which we know nothing else) by Antiochus the Great, in the year 218, Polybius remarks, that the district subject to these two towns could easily furnish abundant support for the whole army.²³⁶ We have also similar testimony at a later date, viz. that of Josephus (*Vita*, 9), that the district of Scythopolis bordered on that of Gadara (see above, p. 88). The district of this town is also mentioned *Bell. Jud.* iv. 8. 2. The subsequent history of Scythopolis, which remained for centuries an important and flourishing town, cannot be further pursued here. On its religious rites, games and industry, compare above, pp. 19, 27, 41.

20. *Pella, Πέλλα*. The district of Pella is designated by Josephus as the northern boundary of Peraea.²³⁷ According to Eusebius, the Jabesh of Scripture was only 6 *m. p.* from Pella, on the road from this latter to Gerasa.²³⁸ Now as Gerasa lies south of the present Wadi Jabis, Pella must have lain a little to the north of it, and hence it is almost certain, that the important ruins at Fahil, on a terrace over the Jordan valley opposite Scythopolis in a south-easterly direction, mark the position of the ancient Pella.²³⁹ That it stood here is further

²³⁶ Polyb. v. 70: εὐθαρσῶς ἔσχε πρὸς τὰς μελλούσας ἐπιβολὰς διὰ τὸ τὴν ὑποτεταγμένην χώραν ταῖς πόλεσι ταύταις βραδύως δύνασθαι παντὶ τῇ στρατοπέδῳ χορηγεῖν καὶ θαυσιλῇ παρασκευάζειν τὰ κατεπείγοντα πρὸς τὴν χρείαν.

²³⁷ *Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 3. Peraea is here taken in its political meaning, i.e. with the exclusion of the towns of Decapolis (comp. above, p. 2). In a geographical sense, it reaches much farther northward, comprising e.g. even Gadara (*Bell. Jud.* iv. 7. 3).

²³⁸ Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lag. p. 225: ἡ δὲ Ἰάβις ἐπέκεινα τοῦ Ἰορδάνου νῦν ἐστὶ μεγίστη πόλις, Πέλλης πόλεως διεστῶσα σημείοις εἰς ἀνιόντων ἐπὶ Γερασάν. Similarly, p. 268 (where however Jabis is more correctly called a κόμμη).

²³⁹ Comp. Robinson's *Palestine*, iii. 320-325. Ritter, xv. 2. 1023-1030. Raumer, p. 254. Guérin, *Galilée*, i. 288-292. Merrill, *East of the Jordan* (1881), pp. 442-447. On the history, Reland, p. 924 sq. Droysen, *Hellenismus*, iii. 2. 204 sq. Kuhn, ii. 374. There is but slight foundation for the objection raised by Kruse (Seetzen's *Reisen*, iv. 198 sqq.) to the above determination of the locality. Korb's thorough discussion of the situation of Pella (Jahn's *Jahrb. für Philologie und Paedagogik*, 4th year, vol. i. 1829, pp. 100-118) places the situation too far northward by partially

borne out by the fact that Pliny describes Pella as *aquis divitem*.²⁴⁰ Whether the original Semitic name was Fahil (פֶּהֶל?), and the name Pella chosen by the Greeks on account of its similarity of sound, may be left uncertain.^{240a} In any case the name Pella was borrowed from the famous Macedonian town of the same name. The latter being the birthplace of Alexander the Great, it is not improbable that our Pella as well as the neighbouring Dium was founded by Alexander the Great himself, as indeed the somewhat corrupt text of Stephanus Byz. declares.²⁴¹ According to another passage of Stephanus Byz. our Pella was also called *Βούτις*.²⁴² Pella is first mentioned in history at the conquest of Palestine by Antiochus the Great, B.C. 218, when after taking Atabyrion (Tabor) he

placing in the foreground the statements of Josephus, and neglecting to do justice to the more precise statements of Eusebius.

²⁴⁰ Plinius, v. 18. 74.

^{240a} Tuch, *Quaestiones de Flavii Josephi libris historicis* (Lips. 1859), p. 18, altogether regards Pella as only the Greek pronunciation for פֶּהֶל, and scouts the idea of any connection with the name of the Macedonian town. This is however more than improbable.

²⁴¹ Steph. Byz. ed. Meineke, s.v. Δῖον, πόλις . . . Κοίλης Συρίας, κτίσμα Ἀλεξάνδρου, καὶ Πέλλα. The words καὶ Πέλλα are probably the gloss of some learned reader, who thus meant to say that Pella as well as Dium was founded by Alexander the Great. The reading ἡ καὶ Πέλλα is an erroneous emendation by some former editor. Comp. also Droysen, iii. 2. 204 sq. A Syrian Pella is also mentioned among the cities founded by Seleucus I. in Appian. *Syr.* 57, and Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene, ii. 116 sq. According to the Latin text of Jerome: Seleucus Antiochiam Laodiciam Seleuciam Apamiam Edessam Beroeam et Pellam urbes condidit. So also Syncell., ed. Dindorf, i. 520, and the Armenian text of Eusebius, in which only Seleucia is missing. By this Pella however we must probably understand the town of Apamea on the Orontes, which was at first called by its founder Seleucus I. Apamea, and afterwards Pella, which name was subsequently lost (see especially Malalas, ed. Dindorf, p. 203 [according to Pausanias Damascenus, comp. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iv. 470]; also Strabo, xvi. p. 752; Stephanus Byz. s.v. Ἀπάμεια; in Diodor. xxi. 25, Apamea occurs under the name of Pella, see Wesseling's note on the passage). It is true that the lists in Appian and Eusebius mention Pella along with Apamea as though they were two different cities. This mistake has however arisen from the circumstance, that the change of name has been looked upon as a second founding, and treated accordingly in the lists of foundations of towns. Hence indeed our Pella (in Decapolis) is out of question.

²⁴² Steph. Byz. s.v. Πέλλα, πόλις . . . Κοίλης Συρίας, ἡ Βούτις λεγομένη.

turned towards the country east of the Jordan and seized Pella, Kamus, and Gephrus.²⁴³ Alexander Jannaeus conquered and destroyed the town, because its inhabitants would not adopt "Jewish customs" (*Bell. Jud.* i. 4. 8; *Antt.* xiii. 15. 4).^{243a} It was again separated from the Jewish region by Pompey (*Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 7). The fact of its having belonged to Decapolis is attested by Eusebius and Epiphanius as well as by Pliny and Ptolemy.²⁴⁴ The few coins which have been preserved bear, as might be expected, the Pompeian era.²⁴⁵ When Pella is named in Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 5) among the chief places of the eleven toparchies of Judaea, this must be ascribed either to a mistake on the part of Josephus himself or to an error in the text. At the commencement of the Jewish war Pella was attacked by the insurgent Jews (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1). During the war the Christian Church fled thither from Jerusalem.²⁴⁶ Christian bishops of Pella are mentioned in the fifth and sixth centuries after Christ.²⁴⁷

21. *Dium, Δίου*. Among the towns of this name, of which Steph. Byz. enumerates seven, that in Macedonia at the foot of Olympus is the best known. Hence it is very credible, that our Dion in Coelesyria was a foundation of Alexander the Great.²⁴⁸ According to the astronomical definitions of Ptolemy (v. 15. 23), Dium lay under the same degree of latitude as

²⁴³ Polyb. v. 70.

^{243a} In the last passage also our Pella is certainly intended, and not another Moabite one. Josephus only names Pella quite at the end of the list after enumerating the Moabite towns, because he desires to append a special remark concerning it. Comp. Tuch, *Quaestiones*, etc., pp. 17-19.

²⁴⁴ Plin. v. 18. 74. Ptolem. v. 15. 23. Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lag. p. 251. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 29. 7; *de mensuris et ponder.* § 15.

²⁴⁵ See Belley in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscr. et Belles-Lettres*, ancient series, vol. xxviii. 568 sqq. Eckhel, iii. 350. Mionnet, v. 329; *Suppl.* viii. 232. De Sauley, pp. 291-293, pl. xvi. n. 8.

²⁴⁶ Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* iii. 5. 2, 3; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 29. 7; *de mensuris et ponder.* § 15.

²⁴⁷ Le Quien, *Oriens christ.* iii. 698 sq.

²⁴⁸ So Steph. Byz. s.v. *Δίου* (see above, note 241). Stephanus remarks

τὸ ὕδωρ νοσερόν, and quotes the following epigram:—

νόμα τὸ Διηνὸν γλυκερὸν ποτόν, ἥνιδὲ πίης,
παύσει μὲν δίψης, εὐθὺς ■ καὶ βίτον.

Pella, but $\frac{1}{2}$ of a degree farther eastward. With this agree the statements of Josephus concerning Pompey's route, that the Jewish king Aristobulus accompanied Pompey on his march from Damascus against the Nabataeans as far as Dium, that here he suddenly separated from Pompey, who therefore now turned suddenly westward and came by Pella and Scythopolis to Judaea.²⁴⁹ Little is known of the history of Dium.²⁵⁰ It was conquered by Alexander Jannaeus (*Antt.* xiii. 15. 3), liberated by Pompey (*Antt.* xiv. 4. 4), and then belonged to Decapolis (Plin. v. 18. 74; Ptolem. v. 15. 23). The coins of Dium, with the legend *Δεινων*, have the Pompeian era. Some of those belonging to the time of Caracalla and Geta are still in existence.²⁵¹ The *Δία* mentioned by Hierocles is certainly identical with this Dium.²⁵²

22. *Gerasa, Γέρασα.* The ruins of the present Dscharásch are the most important in the region east of the Jordan, and are indeed (with those of Palmyra, Baalbec and Petra) among the most important in Syria. There are still in existence considerable remains of temples, theatres and other public buildings. About one hundred columns of a long colonnade, which ran through the middle of the town, are still standing. The buildings seem from their style to belong to the second or third century after Christ.²⁵³ Few inscriptions have as yet

²⁴⁹ Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 3. 3, 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 6. 4, *fin.* Also Menke's *Bibel-Atlas*, sheet iv. In both passages indeed Dium first came into the text through Dindorf's emendations. The older editions have, *Antt.* xiv. 3. 3: εἰς Ἀήλιον πόλιν; *Bell. Jud.* i. 6. 4: ἀπὸ Διοσπόλεως. As certain manuscripts have ἀπὸ διὸς ἡλιουπόλεως (see Cardwell's ed.) we might feel inclined to read Heliopolis in both passages. But the context makes this impossible.

²⁵⁰ Comp. Reland, p. 736 sq. Raumer, p. 247. Kuhn, iii. 382 sq.

²⁵¹ See Belley in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscr. et Belles-Lettres*, ancient series, vol. xxviii. 568 sqq. Eckhel, iii. 347 sq. Mionnet, v. 32; *Suppl.* viii. 26. De Saulcy, pp. 378-383, pl. xix. n. 8, 9.

²⁵² Hierocles, *Synecd.*, ed. Parthey, p. 45. The *Notitia episcopat.*, the same, p. 92. Also in Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 15. 3 the manuscripts have *Δία*.

²⁵³ See in general, Seetzen, *Reisen*, i. 388 sq., iv. 202 sqq. Burckhardt, *Reisen*, i. 401-417, 530-536 (with plan). Buckingham, *Travels in Palestine*, 1821, pp. 353-405. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv. 2. 1077-1094. Bäderer-Socin, *Palästina*, p. 408 sqq. (with plan). Merrill, *East of the Jordan*, pp. 281-290. Illustrations, Laborde, *Voyage en Orient* (Paris 1837 sq.), livraison 9, 16,

been published.²⁵⁴ There can be no doubt that here was the ancient Gerasa.²⁵⁵ The derivation of the name from γέροντες (veterans) of Alexander the Great, who settled here, is based only upon etymological trifling.²⁵⁶ It is certainly possible, that the foundation of Gerasa as a Hellenistic town may reach as far back as Alexander the Great. It is first mentioned in the time of Alexander Jannaeus, when it was in the power of a certain Theodorus (a son of the tyrant Zeno Kotylas of Philadelphia). It was conquered after an arduous siege by Alexander Jannaeus towards the end of his reign.²⁵⁷ It was while still defending the fortress Ragaba "in the district of Gerasa" that he died.²⁵⁸ Gerasa was undoubtedly liberated by Pompey, for it belonged to Decapolis.²⁵⁹ At the outbreak of the Jewish war it was attacked by the Jews (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1); yet the Jews dwelling in the town were spared by the inhabitants (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 5). The Gerasa conquered and destroyed by

34, 35. Key, *Voyage dans le Haouran et aux bords de la mer morte exécuté pendant les années 1857 and 1858* (Paris), Atlas pl. xix.-xxiii. (pl. xxi. plan). Duc de Luynes, *Voyage d'Exploration à la mer morte à Petra et sur la rive gauche du Jourdain*, Paris s. a. (1874), Atlas, pl. 50-57. Also Riehlm's *Wörterb. s.v. "Gadara."*

²⁵⁴ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4661-4664. *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. iii. n. 118, 119. Wetzstein, *Ausgewählte Inschriften* (*Trans. of the Berlin Acad.* 1863), n. 205-207. Böckh, *Report of the Berlin Acad.* 1835, p. 14 sqq. Allen, *American Journal of Philology*, vol. iii. (Baltimore 1882), p. 206. *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, 1882, p. 218 sqq.; 1883, p. 107 sq.

²⁵⁵ Compare on the history, Reland, p. 806 sqq. Pauly's *Encycl.* iii. 770. Winer, s.v. "Gadara." Raumer, p. 249 sq. Ritter, as above. Kuhn, ii. 370, 383.

²⁵⁶ See the passages from Jamblicus and the *Etymolog. magnum* in Droysen, *Hellenismus*, iii. 2. 202 sq. Also Reland, p. 806.

²⁵⁷ *Bell. Jud.* i. 4. 8. In the parallel passage *Antt.* xiii. 15. 3, "Εσσαυ stands instead of Γέρασαν. The reading in *Bell. Jud.* is however certainly the correct one.

²⁵⁸ *Antt.* xiii. 15. 5. Ragaba can hardly be identical with the Ἐργά of Eusebius (p. 216), which lay 15 m. p. westward of Gerasa, and was therefore certainly under the power of Alexander Jannaeus before the conquest of Gerasa.

²⁵⁹ Ptolem. v. 15. 23. Steph. Byz. s.v. Γέρασα, πόλις τῆς Κοίλης Συρίας, τῆς δεκαπόλεως (for such is the reading, as by Meineke, instead of the traditional τεσσαρεσκαίδεκαπόλεως). Plinius, v. 18. 74, names Galasa, for which we must read Gerasa, among the cities of Decapolis.

Lucius Annius at the command of Vespasian (*Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 1) cannot be this Gerasa, which as a Hellenistic town was certainly friendly to the Romans. The few coins of Gerasa (from Hadrian to Alexander Severus) have no era and contain no epithet of the city. They almost all have the superscription "Ἀρτεμις τύχη Γεράσων."²⁶⁰ On an inscription of the time of Trajan the inhabitants are called 'Αντιοχείς πρὸς τῷ Χρυσορόῳ.²⁶¹ Upon another inscription, also of the Roman period, the town is called Γέρασα Ἀντιόχεια.^{261a} In an ethnographic sense Gerasa must be reckoned part of Arabia,²⁶² but seems even in the second century after Christ to have belonged to the province of Syria and only subsequently to have been incorporated in that of Arabia.²⁶³ In the fourth century after Christ it was one of the most important towns of this province.²⁶⁴ Its district was so large,

²⁶⁰ Eckhel, iii. 350. Mionnet, v. 329; *Suppl.* viii. 230 sq. De Saulcy, p. 384 sq., pl. xxii. n. 1, 2.

²⁶¹ Mommsen, *Berichte der sächsisch. Gesellsch. d. Wissensch., philol.-hist. Classe*, vol. ii. 1850, p. 223. Waddington, n. 1722. The inscription was set up in honour of A. Julius Quadratus, the imperial legate of Syria, and indeed in his native Pergamos (where the inscription was discovered). The Gerasenes designate themselves according to Waddington's completion, [Ἀντιο]χείων τῶν [πρὸς τῷ] Χρυσορόῳ τῶν [ρότ]ερον [Γε]ρασηνῶν ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆ[μος]. No other place in Syria is known by the name of Chrysorrhoeas except the Nahr Barada near Damascus (Strabo, xvi. p. 755. Plin. v. 18. 74. Ptolem. v. 15. 9). It is self-evident that this cannot, as Mommsen strangely assumes, be intended here. On the contrary, we find that the rivulet Kerwân running through Gerasa was also called Chrysorrhoeas (see Bäder, p. 409).

^{261a} *American Journal of Philology*, vol. iii. (Baltimore 1882) p. 206, communicated by Allen, from a copy by Merrill. The inscription was found in Gerasa itself. It is an epitaph consisting of four distichs on a woman of the name of Juliana from Antioch. She died in the course of her journey in Gerasa and was buried there, and it is said of her in the epitaph that she will not now return to her home in Antioch, ἀλλ' ἔλαχεν γαί[ης] [Γ]ερ[ά]σ[ης] μέρος Ἀντιοχείης. That the inscription belongs to the Roman period is shown by the name Juliana.

²⁶² Origenes in *Joann.* vol. vi. c. 24 (*Opp.* ed. Lommatsch, i. 239), Γέρασα τῆς Ἀραβίας ἐστὶ πόλις.

²⁶³ See Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. 433, note 1.

²⁶⁴ Ammian. Marc. xiv. 8. 13. Haec quoque civitates habet inter oppida quaedam ingentes Bostram et Gerasam atque Philadelphiam murorum

that Jerome could say, that what was formerly Gilead was now called Gerasa.^{264a} Famous men of Gerasa are mentioned by Steph. Byz.²⁶⁵ The names too of certain Christian bishops are well known.²⁶⁶

23. *Philadelphia*, *Φιλαδέλφεια*, the ancient capital of the Ammonites called in the O. T. "Rabbah of the Ammonites" (רַבָּת בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן), i.e. the chief city of the Ammonites, or more shortly "Rabbah" (רַבָּת).²⁶⁷ In Polybius it is called Rabbat-Amana,²⁶⁸ in Eusebius and Steph. Byz. Amman and Ammana.²⁶⁹ The situation of the town is certainly evidenced by the ruins south of Gerasa, which to this day bear the name of Ammana. The ruins belong, like those of Kanatha, to the Roman period.²⁷⁰ The town received the name of Philadelphia from Ptolemy II.

firmitate cautissimas. Comp. Euseb. *Onomast.* p. 242. Γέρασα, πόλις ἐπίσημος τῆς Ἀραβίας.

^{264a} Hieronymus in *Obadja* v. 19 (Vallarsi, vi. 381): Benjamin autem . . . cunctam possidebit Arabiam, quae prius vocabatur Galaad et nunc Gerasa nuncupatur. Comp. also Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, p. 250.

²⁶⁵ Steph. Byz. s.v. Γέρασα ἐξ αὐτῆς Ἀρίστων ῥήτωρ ἀστυεὺς ἐστίν . . . καὶ Κήρυκος σοφιστῆς καὶ Πλάτων νομικὸς ῥήτωρ. To these must also be added the Neo-Pythagorean philosopher and mathematician Nicomachus of Gerasa, second century after Christ (Fabric. *Bibl. graec.*, ed. Harless, v. 629 sqq.).

²⁶⁶ Epiphan. *Haer.* 73. 26. Le Quien, *Oriens christ.* ii. 859 sq.

²⁶⁷ Deut. iii. 11; Josh. xiii. 25; 2 Sam. xi. 1, xii. 26–29, xvii. 27; Jer. xlix. 2, 3; Ezek. xxi. 25, xxv. 5; Amos i. 14; 1 Chron. xx. 1. On the identity of Rabbah of the Ammonites with Philadelphia, see below the passages from Eusebius (note 269), Steph. Byz. and Jerome (note 271).

²⁶⁸ Polyb. v. 71, Παββατάμανα. So too Steph. Byz. s.v. Παββατάμανα, πόλις τῆς ὀρεινῆς Ἀραβίας.

²⁶⁹ Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lagarde, p. 215, Ἀμμᾶν ἡ νῦν Φιλαδέλφεια, πόλις ἐπίσημος τῆς Ἀραβίας. *Ibid.* p. 219, Ἀμμῶν . . . αὕτη ἐστίν Ἀμμᾶν ἡ καὶ Φιλαδέλφεια, πόλις ἐπίσημος τῆς Ἀραβίας. Comp. *ibid.* p. 288, Παββά, πόλις βασιλείας Ἀμμῶν, αὕτη ἐστὶ Φιλαδέλφεια. Steph. Byz., see note 271.

²⁷⁰ See in general, Seetzen, *Reisen*, i. 396 sqq., iv. 212 sqq. Burckhardt, *Reisen*, ii. 612–618. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv. 2. 1145–1159. De Saulcy, *Voyage en Terre Sainte*, 1865, i. 237 sqq. (with plan). Bäderker-Socin, *Palästina*, p. 318 sqq. (with plan). Merrill, *East of the Jordan*, p. 399 sqq. Conder, *Quarterly Statement*, 1882, pp. 99–112. Illustrations, Laborde, *Voyage en Orient* (Paris 1837 sqq.), livr. 28, 29. On the history, besides Ritter, the article on "Rabbath Ammon" in Winer's *Realwörterb.*, Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* (1st ed. xii. 469 sq.), Schenkel's *Bibellex.*, Riehm's *WB.* Kuhn, ii 383 sq.

(Philadelphus), to whom consequently its Hellenization is to be referred.²⁷¹ In the time of Antiochus the Great it was a strong fortress, which in the year 218 B.C. he vainly endeavoured to take by storm, and of which he was unable to get possession, till a prisoner showed him the subterranean path, by which the inhabitants came out to draw water. This being stopped up by Antiochus, the town was forced to surrender for want of water.²⁷² About 135 B.C. (at the death of Simon Maccabaeus) Philadelphia was in the power of a certain Zenos Kotylas (*Antt.* xiii. 8. 1; *Bell. Jud.* i. 2. 4). It was not conquered by Alexander Jannaeus, though he had possession of Gerasa to the north and Esbon to the south of it. Hence Philadelphia is not named among the towns which were separated by Pompey from the Jewish region. It was however joined by him to the confederacy of Decapolis²⁷³ and had therefore the Pompeian era.²⁷⁴ It was in its neighbourhood that Herod fought against the Arabians.²⁷⁵ In A.D. 44 sanguinary contests took place between the Jews

²⁷¹ Steph. Byz. s.v. Φιλαδέλφεια . . . τῆς Συρίας ἐπιφανὲς πόλις, ἡ πρότερον Ἀμμωνα, εἴτ' Ἀστάρτη, εἴτα Φιλαδέλφεια ἀπὸ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου. Hieronymus in *Ezek.* c. 25 (Vallarsi, v. 285): Rabbath, quae hodie a rege Aegypti Ptolemaeo cognomento Philadelpho, qui Arabiam tenuit cum Judaea, Philadelphia nuncupata est. L. Müller (*Numismatique d'Alexandre le Grand*, p. 309, pl. n. 1473 sqq.) refers certain coins of Alexander the Great, with the letters Φι to our Philadelphia. Although it would not be impossible for coins with the name of Alexander to be issued in the days of Ptolemy II. (see note 150, above), yet the correctness of this explanation seems to me very questionable. Philoteria e.g. (Polyb. v. 70) might be intended.

²⁷² Polyb. v. 71. Conder found in his surveys at Amman a path, which is possibly identical with that mentioned by Polybius, see *Athenæum*, 1883, n. 2905, p. 832: *The discovery at Ammân*. Comp. also *Quarterly Statement*, 1882, p. 109.

²⁷³ Plinius, v. 18. 74.

²⁷⁴ *Chron. paschale* (ed. Dindorf, i. 351), ad Olymp. 179. 2 = 63 B.C., Φιλαδελφεῖς ἐντεῦθεν ἀριθμοῦσι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν χρόνους. The era is also frequently found upon coins. See Noris, iii. 9. 2 (ed. Lips. pp. 308–316). Eckhel, iii. 351. Mionnet, v. 330–333; *Suppl.* viii. 232–236. De Saulcy, pp. 386–392, pl. xxii. n. 8–9.

²⁷⁵ *Bell. Jud.* i. 19. 5. In the parallel passage *Antt.* xv. 5. 4, Philadelphia is not mentioned.

of Peraea and the Philadelphians concerning the boundaries of a village called Mia in our present text of Josephus, but for which Zia is probably the correct reading (*Antt.* xx. 1. 1).²⁷⁶ At the outbreak of the Jewish war, Philadelphia was attacked by the insurgent Jews (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1). Upon an inscription of the second century after Christ our Philadelphia is called *Φιλαδέλφεια τῆς Ἀραβίας*.²⁷⁷ This is however meant only in an ethnographical sense. For coins down to Alexander Severus have the superscription *Φιλαδέλφειον, Κοίτης Συρίας*.²⁷⁸ The town therefore still belonged to the province of Syria and was probably allotted to the province of Arabia towards the close of the third century.²⁷⁹ In the fourth century it was one of the most important towns of this province.²⁸⁰ Josephus mentions the district of Philadelphia (*Φιλαδελφηνή*) as the eastern boundary of Peraea (*Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 3). If the supposition be warranted, that Zia is the correct reading in Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 1. 1, the district of Philadelphia must have extended to about 15 *m. p.* westward of the town, in other words, full half of the land lying between the Jordan and the town must have belonged to the Philadelphian district.

It is an undoubted fact, that all the cities hitherto described formed independent political communities, which—at least after the time of Pompey—were never internally blended into an organic unity with the Jewish region, but were at most externally united with it under the same ruler. Almost all of them had a chiefly heathen population, which after the third century before

²⁷⁶ A village of Zia lying 15 *m. p.* west of Philadelphia is mentioned by Eusebius, *Onomast.* p. 258, καὶ ἔστι νῦν Ζία κώμη ὡς ἀπὸ ἐξ σημείων Φιλαδέλφειας ἐπὶ δυσμάς. The supposition that Zia is the correct reading in this passage has been already expressed by Reland (p. 897), Havercamp (on Joseph. *l.c.*) and Tuch, *Quaestiones de Fl. Josephi libris historicis*, Lips. 1859, p. 19 sq.

²⁷⁷ Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscr.* vol. iii. n. 1620b; comp. above, p. 25.

²⁷⁸ See Mionnet, *Suppl.* viii. 236. De Saulcy, p. 392.

²⁷⁹ Comp. Marquardt, i. 433, note 1.

²⁸⁰ Ammian. Marcellin. xiv. 8. 13 (see above, note 264). Comp. also the passages from Eusebius (note 269).

Christ became more and more Hellenistic in its character. It was only in Joppa and Jamnia and perhaps in Azotus, that the Jewish element obtained during and after the Maccabaeian period the ascendancy. But even these towns with their respective districts formed both before and after that time independent political units.—To the same category belonged also, as Kuhn correctly admits,²⁸¹ *the towns which were refounded by Herod and his sons*. It is true, that in many of these the population was mainly Jewish. But even where this was the case, the constitution was of Hellenistic organization, as is shown especially in the case of Tiberias. In most of them however the heathen population preponderated. Hence we must not assume, that they were organically incorporated with the Jewish realm, but that they occupied within it an independent position similar to that of the older Hellenistic towns. Nay in Galilee, where it was indeed impregnated with heathen elements, the Jewish country seems, on the contrary, to have been subordinate to the newly built capitals—first to Sepphoris, then to Tiberias, then again to Sepphoris (see the articles concerning them). Among the towns built by Herod certainly the two most important were Sebaste, *i.e.* Samaria, and Caesarea, the latter of which has been already spoken of (No. 9). Of less importance were Gaba in Galilee and Esbon in Peraea (*Antt.* xv. 8. 5), which must also be regarded as chiefly heathen towns, for at the outbreak of the Jewish war they, like Ptolemais and Caesarea, Gerasa and Philadelphia, were attacked by the insurgent Jews (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1). Lastly, we have to mention as towns founded by Herod, Antipatris and Phasaelis, Kypros named together with the latter being a mere castle near Jericho and not a *πόλις* (*Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 9; *Antt.* xvi. 5. 2), which also applies to the fortresses of Alexandreion, Herodeion, Hyrcania, Masada and Machaerus. Among the sons of Herod, Archelaus founded only the village (*κώμη*) of Archelais.²⁸² Philip, on the

²⁸¹ *Die städtische und bürgerliche Verfassung des röm. Reichs*, ii. 346-348.

²⁸² Comp. Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 13. 1; *Antt.* xviii. 2. 2. Plinius, xiii. 4,

other hand, built Caesarea = Paniaas and Julias = Bethsaida, and Herod Antipas the cities of Sepphoris, Julias = Livias and Tiberias. These ten cities still remain to be treated of:

24. *Sebaste* = Samaria.²⁸³ The Hellenization of the town of Samaria (Hebr. שְׁכֶרֶת) was the work of Alexander the Great. The Samaritans had during his stay in Egypt, B.C. 332-331, assassinated Andromachus his governor in Coelesyria. Consequently when Alexander returned from Egypt (B.C. 331), he executed strict justice upon the offenders and planted Macedonian colonists in Samaria.²⁸⁴ The *Chronicle* of Eusebius speaks also of a refoundation by Perdiccas,²⁸⁵ which could only have taken place during his campaign against Egypt (B.C. 321); this is however very improbable so soon after the colonization by Alexander the Great. As in old times so now also Samaria was an important fortress. Hence it was levelled by Ptolemy Lagos, when in the year B.C. 312 he again surrendered to Antigonus the land of Coelesyria, which he

44. Ptolem. v. 16. 7. According to the *Tabula Peutinger.*, Archelais lay on the road from Jericho to Scythopolis 12 *m. p.* from Jericho and 24 *m. p.* from Scythopolis. See also Robinson's *Palestine*, iii. 569. Ritter, xv. i. 457. Guérin, *Samarie*, i. 235-238. *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, ii. 387, 395 sq., and sheet xv. of the chart.

²⁸³ Compare in general, Reland, pp. 979-983. Pauly's *Encycl.* vi. 1. 727 sq. Winer, s.v. "Samaria." Raumer, p. 159 sq. Robinson's *Palestine*, iii. 126, 127. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xvi. 658-666. Guérin, *Samarie*, ii. 188-210. Bäder-Socin, p. 354 sqq. Sepp, *Jerusalem*, ii. 66-74. *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, ii. 160 sq., 211-215 (with plan), also sheet xv. of the large English chart.

²⁸⁴ Curtius, *Rufus*, iv. 8: Oneravit hunc dolorem nuntius mortis Andromachi, quem praefecerat Syriae: vivum Samaritae cremaverant. Ad cujus interitum vindicandum, quanta maxime celeritate potuit, contendit, adventique sunt traditi tanti sceleris auctores. Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene, ii. 114 (ad ann. Abr. 1680, according to the Armenian): Andromachum regionum illorum procuratorem constituit, quem incolae urbis Samaritarum interfecerunt: quos Alexander ab Egipto reversus punivit: *capta urbe Macedonas ut ibi habitarent collocavit.* — So too Syncell., ed. Dindorf, i. 496: τὴν Σαμαρείαν πόλιν ἐλὼν Ἀλέξανδρος Μακεδόνως ἐν αὐτῇ κατέκτισεν.

²⁸⁵ See below, note 287, and also Droysen, iii. 2. 204. Ewald's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. p. 293.

had shortly before conquered.²⁸⁶ Some fifteen years later (about 296 B.C.) Samaria, which had meanwhile been restored, was again destroyed by Demetrius Poliorcetes in his contest with Ptolemy Lagos.²⁸⁷ Thenceforward we are for a long time without special data for the history of the town. Polybius indeed mentions, that Antiochus the Great in both his first and second conquest of Palestine 218 and 198 B.C. occupied the country of Samaria,²⁸⁸ but the fate of the town is not further indicated. It is of interest to find, that the country of Samaria, under the Ptolemies as well as under the Seleucidae, formed like Judaea a single province, which again was subdivided into separate *νομοί*.²⁸⁹ Towards the end of the second century before Christ, when the Seleucidian Epigonoi were no longer able to prevent the encroachments of the Jews, the town fell a victim to their policy of conquest; and Samaria—then a *πόλις ὀχυρωτάτη*—was again conquered in the reign of John Hyrcanus (B.C. 107) by his sons Antigonus and Aristobulus after a siege of a year, and entirely given up to destruction (*Antt.* xiii. 10. 2, 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 2. 7).²⁹⁰ Alexander Jannaeus had possession of the town or its ruins (*Antt.* xiii. 15. 4). It was separated from the Jewish region by Pompey and never henceforth organically combined with it (*Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 7). Its rebuilding was the work of Gabinius (*Antt.* xv. 14. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 8. 4), on which account its inhabitants were for a while called *Γαβινιεύς*.²⁹¹

²⁸⁶ Diodor. xix. 93. Comp. above, note 52 (Gaza), 109 (Joppa), 151 (Ptolemais).

²⁸⁷ Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene, ii. 118 (ad Olymp. 121. 1=296 B.C. according to the Armenian): Demetrius rex Asianorum, Poliorcetes appellatus, Samaritanorum urbem a Perdica constructam (s. incolis frequentatam) totam cepit. Syncell., ed. Dindorf, i. 519: Δημήτριος ὁ Πολιορκητὴς τὴν πόλιν Σαμαρείων ἐπόρθησεν. So too i. 522. Comp. Droysen, ii. 2. 243, 255. Stark, p. 361.

²⁸⁸ Polyb. v. 71. 11, xvi. 49=Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 3. 3.

²⁸⁹ See in general, *Antt.* xii. 4. 1, 4; 1 Macc. x. 30, 38, xi. 28, 34.

²⁹⁰ On the chronology, comp. above, § 8.

²⁹¹ Cedrenus, ed. Beker, i. 323: τὴν τῶν Γαβινιῶν (l. Γαβινιέων) πόλιν, τὴν ποτὲ Σαμαρείαν (Herodes) ἐπικτίσας Σεβαστὴν αὐτὴν προσηγόρευσε. Cedrenus here indeed mistakes Herod the Great for Herod Antipas and the latter again for Herod Agrippa.

The town was bestowed upon Herod by Augustus (*Antt.* xv. 7. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 20. 3); and by his means it first regained prosperity. For while it had hitherto been a comparatively small though strong town, its extent was so greatly increased by Herod, that it was now twenty stadia in circumference and not inferior to the most important towns. In the city thus enlarged Herod settled six thousand colonists, composed partly of disbanded soldiers, partly of people from the neighbourhood. The colonists received excellent estates. The fortifications too were rebuilt and extended, and finally the town obtained also, by the erection of a temple to Augustus and other magnificent edifices, the splendour of modern culture.²⁹² Herod gave to the newly-rebuilt town the name of *Σεβαστή* (*Antt.* xv. 8. 5; *Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 2. Strabo, xvi. p. 860) in honour of the emperor, who had recently assumed the title of Augustus. The coins of the town bear the inscription *Σεβαστηνῶν* or *Σεβαστηνῶν Συρ(ίας)* and a special era commencing with the year of the rebuilding of the city, *i.e.* according to the usual view 25 or perhaps more correctly 27 B.C.²⁹³ The town is also mentioned in Rabbinical literature by its new name of Sebaste (סבסטי).²⁹⁴ When Josephus says, that Herod granted it "an excellent constitution," *ἐξάίπετον εὐνομίαν* (*Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 2), he makes indeed no great addition to our knowledge. It is however probable from other reasons, that the country of Samaria was subordinated to the town of Sebaste precisely as Galilee was to the capitals Sepphoris and Tiberias respectively and Judaea was to Jerusalem. For on the occasion of the tumults of the

²⁹² Considerable remains of a large colonnade running along the hill, the building of which is probably to be ascribed to Herod, are still in existence. See the literature cited in note 283.

²⁹³ On the date of the rebuilding, see § 15. On the coins in general, Noris, v. 5 (ed. Lips. pp. 531-536). Eckhel, iii. 440. Mionnet, v. 513-516; *Suppl.* viii. 356-359. De Saulcy, pp. 275-281, pl. xiv. n. 4-7.

²⁹⁴ Mishna, *Arachin* iii. 2 (the "pleasure gardens of Sebaste," פֶּרְדֵּסֵי סבסטי, are here adduced as an example of specially valuable property. See the commentary of Bartenora in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, v. 198). Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, p. 171 sq.

Samaritans under Pilate a "council of Samaritans," *Σαμαρέων ἡ βουλή*, is mentioned, which seems to point to a united organization of the country (*Antt.* xviii. 4. 2).^{294a} Sebastenian soldiers served in the army of Herod and embraced the party of the Romans against the Jews in the conflicts which broke out at Jerusalem after his death (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 3. 4, 4. 2, 3; comp. *Antt.* xvii. 10. 3). At the partition of Palestine after the decease of Herod, Sebaste with the rest of Samaria fell to Archelaus (*Antt.* xvii. 11. 4; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 3), after whose banishment it remained for a time under Roman procurators, was then temporarily under Agrippa, and then again under procurators. During this last period Sebastenian soldiers formed a main element in the Roman troops stationed in Judaea (see above, p. 65). At the outbreak of the Jewish war Sebaste was attacked by the insurgent Jews (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1). The town of Sebaste, with its chiefly heathen population, then remained as during the disturbances that followed the death of Herod (*Antt.* xvii. 10. 9; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 5. 1) undoubtedly on the side of the Romans, while the native Samaritans in the district of Sichem certainly occupied a difficult position (*Bell. Jud.* iii. 7. 32). Sebaste became a Roman colony under Septimius Severus.²⁹⁵ But its importance henceforth declined before the prosperity of Neapolis = Sichem.²⁹⁶ Eusebius and Stephanus Byz. still call Sebaste only "a small town."²⁹⁷ Its district was nevertheless

^{294a} On the constitution and political position given by Herod to the town, see especially Kuhn, *Ueber die Entstehung der Städte der Alten* (1878), pp. 422 sq., 428 sqq.

²⁹⁵ *Digest*, lib. xv. 1. 7 (from Ulpianus): Divus quoque Severus in Sebastenam civitatem coloniam deduxit. On coins, COL. L. SEP. SEBASTE. Comp. Eckhel, iii. 441. Zumpt, *Commentationes epigr.* i. 432. Kuhn, ii. 56. The coins in Mionnet and De Sauley, as above.

²⁹⁶ Ammianus Marcellinus, xiv. 8. 11, names Neapolis, but not Sebaste, among the most important towns of Palestine. Comp. above, note 88.

²⁹⁷ Euseb. *Onomast.* p. 292: Σεβαστήν, τὴν νῦν πολίχνην τῆς Παλαιστίνης. Steph. Byz. s.v. Σεβαστή . . . ἵσται δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ Σαμαρείτιδι πολίχνην.

so large, that it comprised *e.g.* Dothaim, which lay 12 *m. p.* northward of the town.²⁹⁸

25. *Gaba*, Γάβα or Γαβά. The name corresponds to the Hebrew גִּבְעָה or גִּבְעָה, a hill, and is a frequent local name in Palestine. We are here concerned only with a Gaba, which according to the decided statements of Josephus stood on Carmel, and indeed in the great plain near the district of Ptolemais and the borders of Galilee, and therefore on the north-eastern declivity of Carmel (see especially, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 1, and *Vita*, 24). Herod here settled a colony of retired knights, on which account the city was also called πόλις ἱππέων (*Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 1; *Antt.* xv. 8. 5).²⁹⁹ From the manner in which the town is mentioned in the two passages, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 1; *Vita*, 24, it is evident that it did not belong to the district of Galilee. Its population being chiefly heathen, it was attacked by the Jews at the beginning of the Jewish insurrection (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1), while on the other hand it took an active part in the struggle against the Jews (*Vita*, 24). This town is probably the Geba on Carmel mentioned by Pliny.³⁰⁰ Whatever other material has been adduced to the contrary by scholars with respect to Gaba, has served to complicate rather than throw light upon the questions concerning its situation and history.³⁰¹ A Gabe 16 *m. p.* from Caesarea is mentioned by Eusebius, but the distance stated is

²⁹⁸ Euseb. *Onomast.* p. 249: Δωδαεῖμ . . . διαμένει ἐν ὁρίοις Σεβαστῆς, ἀπέχει δὲ αὐτῆς σημείοις β' ἐπὶ τὰ βόρεια μέρη.

²⁹⁹ The latter passage (*Antt.* xv. 8. 5) is according to the usual text: ἐν τε τῷ μεγάλῳ πεδίῳ, τῶν ἐπιλέκτων ἱππέων περὶ αὐτὸν ἀποκληρώσας, χωρίον συνέκτισεν ἐπὶ τε τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ Γάβα καλούμενον καὶ τῇ Περαιᾷ τὴν Ἐσεβωνίτιν. According to this it might be supposed that Herod had founded three colonies: 1. an unknown place in the great plain; 2. a place called Gaba in Galilee; and 3. Esebonitis in Peraea. The two first are, however, certainly identical; the τε after ἐπὶ must be omitted, and the meaning of ἐπὶ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ is, as the whole context shows, "for the controlling of Galilee." This also confirms the view, that Gaba lay on the eastern declivity of Carmel. For the rest, the reading here, as well as in *Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 1, fluctuates between Γάβα and Γαβαλα, but the former is preferable.

³⁰⁰ Plinius, *H. N.* v. 19. 75.

³⁰¹ See in general, Reland, p. 769. Pauly's *Encycl.* iii. 563. Kuhn, *Dis*

too short to suit the situation north-east of Carmel.³⁰² Still more improbable is it, that the coins with the superscription *Κλαυδι(έων) Φιλιπ(πέων) Γαβηνῶν* belong to our Gaba. These titles point rather to a Gaba, which had belonged to the Tetrarch Philip;³⁰³ and the Gabe, mentioned by Pliny as near Caesarea Panias, may be identical with it.³⁰⁴ Lastly, which Gaba the *Γάβαι* in *Palaestina secunda*, mentioned by Hierocles, may be, must be left uncertain.³⁰⁵ Guérin thinks he has discovered one Gaba in the village of Sheikh Abreik upon a hill near Carmel, with the situation of which the statements of Josephus certainly agree.³⁰⁶

26. *Esbon* or *Hesbon*, Hebr. *הֶשְׁבֹן*, in the LXX. and Eusebius *Ἑσβεβών*, Josephus *Ἑσσεβών*, later *Ἑσβούς*. The town lay, according to Josephus, 20 *m. p.* east of the Jordan,

städt. und bürgerl. Verf. ii. 320, 350 sq. The same, *Ueber die Entstehung der Städte der Alten*, p. 424. Quandt, *Judäa und die Nachbarschaft im Jahrh. vor und nach der Geburt Christi* (1873), p. 120 sq.

³⁰² Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lagarde, p. 246: *καὶ ἔστι πολικυνη Γαβὲ καλουμένη ὡς ἀπὸ σημείων ἐκ τῆς Καισαρείας* et alia villa Gabatha in finibus Diocaesareae παρακειμένη τῷ μεγάλῃ πεδίῳ τῆς Λεγεῶνος. The words here interpolated in Latin from Hieronymus have been omitted from the text of Eusebius through homoioteleuton. Through their omission it came to appear, that the little town of Gabe was 16 *m. p.* from Caesarea, and yet at the same time in the great plain of Legeon (Megiddo), which is not possible. The Gabe of Eusebius seems, on the contrary, to be identical with *Jeba*, which is marked on the large English chart directly north of Caesarea on the western declivity of Carmel. *Map of Western Palestine*, sheet viii. to the left, above; also *Memoirs*, ii. 42, where indeed this Jeba is identified with *πόλις ἱππέων*.

³⁰³ See on the coins, Noris, iv. 5. 6 (ed. Lips. pp. 458-462). Eckhel, iii. 344 sqq. Mionnet, v. 316-318; *Suppl.* viii. 220-222. De Saulcy, pp. 339-343, pl. xix. n. 1-7. The coins have an era commencing somewhere between 693 and 696 A.U.C.

³⁰⁴ Plinius, *H. N.* v. 18. 74.

³⁰⁵ Hierocles, *Synecd.*, ed. Parthey, p. 44.

³⁰⁶ Guérin, *Galilée*, i. 395-397. Sheikh Abreik lies upon an isolated eminence close to Carmel, under the same degree of latitude as Nazareth. Compare *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, i. 343-351, also the English map, sheet v. It is certainly incorrect to seek for Gaba in the situation of the present Jebata, as Menke does in his *Bibel-Atlas*. The latter is much too far from Carmel, in the midst of the plain; and is, on the contrary, identical with the Gabatha of Eusebius (see note 302).

opposite Jericho.³⁰⁷ With this agrees exactly the situation of the present Hesbân, east of Jordan, under the same degree of latitude as the northern point of the Dead Sea, where ruins are also found.³⁰⁸ Hesbon is frequently mentioned as the capital of an Amorite kingdom.³⁰⁹ In Isaiah and Jeremiah, on the other hand, it appears as a Moabite town.³¹⁰ And as such it is also mentioned by Josephus even in the time of Alexander Jannaeus, by whose victories it was incorporated in the Jewish region (*Antt.* xiii. 15. 4). Its further history cannot be accurately followed. At all events it was in the possession of Herod, when he refortified it for the control of Peraea, and placed in it a military colony (*Antt.* xv. 8. 5).³¹¹ The district of Esbon is mentioned as the eastern boundary of Peraea by Josephus, hence it did not in a political sense belong to Peraea.³¹² At the outbreak of the Jewish war, it was

³⁰⁷ Euseb. *Onomast.* p. 253: 'Εσεβών . . . καλεῖται δὲ νῦν Ἐσβοῦς, ἐπίσημος πόλις τῆς Ἀραβίας, ἐν ὁρεσὶ τοῖς ἀντικρὺ τῆς Ἱεριχοῦς κειμένη, ὡς ἀπὸ σημεῖων x' τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.

³⁰⁸ See Seetzen, *Reisen*, i. 497, iv. 220 sqq. Burckhardt, *Reisen*, ii. 623 sq., 1068. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv. 2. 1176–1181. De Saulcy, *Voyage en Terre Sainte* (1865), i. 279 sqq. (with a plan of the ruins). Bäderker-Socin, *Palästina*, p. 318. On the history, Reland, p. 719 sq. Raumer, p. 262. The articles on "Hesbon," in Winer, Schenkel, Riehm, Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* 1st ed. vi. 21 sq. Kuhn, *Die städt. und bürgerl. Verfassung*, ii 337, 386 sq.

³⁰⁹ Num. xxi. 26 sqq.; Deut. i. 4, ii. 24 sqq., iii. 2 sqq., iv. 46; Josh. ix. 9, xii. 2 sqq., xiii. 10, 21; Judg. xi. 19 sqq. Comp. also Judith v. 15.

³¹⁰ Isa. xv. 4, xvi. 8, 9; Jer. xlviii. 2, 34, 35, xlix. 3.

³¹¹ Thus certainly must the passage cited be understood; see on its tenor, note 299. The form Ἐσεβωνίτις is the designation of the district of Esbon. The town itself is called Ἐσεβών or Ἐσεβών. Σεβωνίτις occurs for Ἐσεβωνίτις, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1, iii. 3. 3. See the following note.

³¹² Σεβωνίτις is certainly the reading, as in *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1, instead of Σιλβωνίτις. In Menke's *Bibel-Atlas*, sheet v., Essebon is correctly placed outside Peraea; on the other hand, it is incorrectly allotted to the Nabataean realm instead of to that of Herod the Great. It is possible that after the death of Herod it may have fallen into the hands of the Arabians, as e.g. Machaerus also temporarily belonged to them (*Antt.* xviii. 5. 1). The circumstance that Esbon, after the erection of Arabia to the rank of a province, belonged thereto favours this supposition. Less convincing is the mention of the Esbonitae Arabes in Plinius, v. 11. 65, since this is only said in an ethnographical sense. In any case the Σεβωνίτις formed in the time of

attacked by the insurgent Jews (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1). At the creation of the province of Arabia, A.D. 105, Esbon, or as it was now called Esbus, was probably forthwith awarded to it, for Ptolemy already speaks of it as belonging to Arabia.³¹³ The few coins as yet known are those of either Caracalla or Elagabalus.³¹⁴ It was an important town in the time of Eusebius,³¹⁵ and Christian bishops of Esbus (*Esbundorum*, Ἐσβουντίων) are mentioned in the fourth and fifth centuries.³¹⁶

27. *Antipatris*, Ἀντιπατρίς.³¹⁷ The original name of this town was *Καφαρσαβά*,³¹⁸ or *Καβαρσαβά*,³¹⁹ sometimes *Καπερσαβίνη*,³²⁰ Hebrew כפר סבא, under which name it also occurs in Rabbinical literature.³²¹ Its situation is evidenced by the present *Kefr-Saba*, north-eastward of Joppa, the position of

Josephus a town district proper, which though perhaps subject to the Arabians, was still distinct from the other Arabias, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 3.

³¹³ Ptolem. v. 17. 6. The town is here called Ἐσβουρα (so also the Codex of Vatopedi, see *Géographie de Ptolémée, reproduction photolithographique*, etc., Paris 1867, p. lvii. below), which however is properly the accusative form of Ἐσβους.

³¹⁴ Eckhel, iii. 503. Mionnet, v. 585 sq.; *Suppl.* viii. 387. De Saulcy, p. 393, pl. xxiii. n. 5-7.

³¹⁵ See above, note 307. Eusebius also frequently mentions the town elsewhere in the *Onomasticon*. See Lagarde's Index, s.v. *εσβουν*, *εσεβουν* and *εσεβους*.

³¹⁶ Le Quien, *Oriens christianus*, ii. 863.

³¹⁷ See on the subject generally, Reland, p. 569 sq., 690. Pauly's *Enc.* i. 1. 1150. Kuhn, ii. 351. Winer, s.v. "Antipatris." Raumer, p. 147. Robinson's *Palestine*, ii. p. 242, iii. pp. 138, 139. Ritter, xvi. 569-572. Guérin, *Samarie*, ii. 357-367; comp. ii. 132 sq. Wilson, *Quarterly Statement*, 1874, pp. 192-196. *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, ii. 134, 258-262; the English map, sheets x. and xiii. Ebers and Guthe, *Palästina*, vol. ii. p. 452.

³¹⁸ Joseph. *Antt.* xvi. 5. 2.

³¹⁹ Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 15. 1. The reading here fluctuates between *Καβαρσαβα*, *Καβαρσαβα* and *Καβαρζαβα*.

³²⁰ Such is undoubtedly the reading instead of *και περσαβινη* in the passage of the *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. Dindorf, i. 367: ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ καὶ Ἀνθηδόνα ἐπικτίσας Ἀγρίππειαν ἐκάλεσεν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ περσαβίνην εἰς ὄνομα Ἀντιπάτρου τοῦ ἰδίου πατρὸς. Comp. Reland, pp. 690, 925. In the parallel passage in Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 595, it is said: ἔτι τε Περσανάβαν εἰς τιμὴν Ἀντιπάτρου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἀντιπατρίδα ὠνόμασε.

³²¹ Tosefta, *Nidda* 649. 35 (ed. Zuckermann); *Bab. Nidda* 61^a; *Jer. Demai* ii. 1, fol. 22c. Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. für Bibel und Talmud*, ii. 637, art. "Kepharsaba."

which agrees with the statements of ancient writers concerning Antipatris, that it was 150 stadia from Joppa,³²² at the entrance of the mountainous district,³²³ and 26 *m. p.* south of Caesarea, on the road thence to Lydia.³²⁴ Herod here founded in a well-watered and well-wooded plain a new city, which he called Antipatris in honour of his father Antipater (*Antt.* xvi. 5. 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 9). The town is also mentioned in Rabbini-cal literature under this name, אַנְטִיפַטְרִיס;³²⁵ also by Ptolemy, Eusebius, and Stephanus Byzantinus.³²⁶ It was much reduced in the fourth century after Christ, being spoken of in the *Itinerar. Burdig.*, not as a *civitas*, but only as a *mutatio* (stopping place), and designated by Jerome as a *semirutum opidulum*.³²⁷ Yet a Bishop of Antipatris still occurs in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451.³²⁸ Its existence in these later times is also elsewhere evidenced.³²⁹ Nay, so late as the eighth century after Christ it is still spoken of as a town inhabited by Christians.³³⁰

28. *Phasaelis*, Φασαηλῖς.³³¹ It was in honour of his brother Phasael that Herod founded in the Jordan valley, in a

³²² *Antt.* xiii. 15. 1.

³²³ *Bell. Jud.* i. 4. 7.

³²⁴ The *Itinerarium Burdigalense* (in Tobler and Molinier, *Itinera*, etc., p. 20) gives the distance from Caesarea to Antipatris at 26 *m. p.*, that from Antipatris to Lydda at 10 *m. p.* The former number agrees almost exactly with the situation of Kefr-Saba, the latter is in consequence of a clerical error too little. The general situation of Antipatris, as on the road from Caesarea to Lydda, is also elsewhere testified; see *Antt.* xxiii. 31; Joseph *Bell. Jud.* ii. 19. 1, 9, iv. 8. 1. Hieronym. *Peregrinatio Paulae* (in Tobler, *Palaestinae descr.* p. 13). The reasons brought forward by Guérin, Wilson, Conder, and Mühlau (Riehm's *Wörterb.*) against the identity of Kefr-Saba and Antipatris do not seem to me decisive.

³²⁵ Mishna, *Gittin* vii. 7; *Bab. Gittin* 76^a. Lightfoot, *Centuria Matthaeo praemissa*, c. 58 (Opp. ii. 214). Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, pp. 86-90. Hamburger, *Real-Encycl.* ii. 63, art. "Antipatris."

³²⁶ Ptolemaeus, v. 16. 6. Eusebius, *Onomast.* pp. 245, 246. Steph. Byz. *s.v.*

³²⁷ See the passages cited, note 324.

³²⁸ Le Quien, *Oriens christianus*, iii. 579 sq.

³²⁹ Hierocles, *Synecd.* (ed. Parthey) p. 43. The *Notitia episcopat.* (the same), p. 143.

³³⁰ Theophanis, *Chronographia, ad ann. Dom.* 743 (ed. Bonnens. i. 658).

³³¹ See in general, Reland, p. 953 sq. Pauly's *Enc.* v. 1439. Raumer, p. 216. Robinson's *Palestine*, i. p. 569, iii. p. 293. Ritter, xv. 1. 458 sq.

hitherto untilled but fertile region, which was thus gained for cultivation, the city of Phasaelis (*Antt.* xvi. 5. 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 9). After his death the town, with its valuable palm plantations, came into the possession of his sister Salome (*Antt.* xviii. 8. 1, 11. 5; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 3); and after her death into that of the Empress Livia (*Antt.* xviii. 2. 2; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 1). Pliny speaks of the excellent dates obtained from the palm trees growing there.³³² The town is also mentioned by Ptolemy, Stephanus Byz., and the geographers of Ravenna.³³³ Its name has been preserved in the present Karbet Fasail on the edge of the plain of the Jordan, in a fertile district. The stream flowing thence to the Jordan is called Wadi Fasail.³³⁴

29. *Caesarea Panias*.³³⁵ *Tò Πάνειον* properly means the grotto dedicated to Pan at the source of the Jordan.³³⁶ It is first mentioned under this name by Polybius in the time of Antiochus the Great, who there gained (198 B.C.) over the

Guérin, *Samarie*, i. 228-232. *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, ii. 388, 392; and the large English map, sheet xv.

³³² Plinius, *H. N.* xiii. 4. 44: Sed ut copia ibi atque fertilitas, ita nobilitas in Judaea, nec in tota, sed Hiericunte maxume, quamquam laudatae et Archelaide et Phaselide atque Liviade, gentis ejusdem convallibus.

³³³ Ptolem. v. 16. 7. Steph. Byz. s.v. *Geographus Ravennas*, edd. Pinder et Parthey (1860), p. 84. The town is also mentioned in the Middle Ages (in Burchardus and Marinus Sanutus), see the passages in Guérin, *Samarie*, i. 231 sq.

³³⁴ See especially the large English map, sheet xv., and the description in Guérin and Conder, as above.

³³⁵ See on the general subject, Reland, pp. 918-922. Winer's *RWB.* and Schenkel's *Bibelles.* s.v. "Caesarea." Kuhn, ii. 334. Robinson's *Palestine*, iii. 397-413. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv. 1. 195-207. Guérin, *Galilée*, ii. 308-323. *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, i. 95, 109-113, 125-128; the large English map, sheet ii. Ebers and Guthe, *Palästina in Bild und Wort*, i. 356-366. Views of the Pan-Grotto in the Duc de Luynes *Voyage d' Exploration*, etc., Atlas, plates 62, 63. Inscriptions, *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4537-4539. Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscriptions*, vol. iii. n. 1891-1894.

³³⁶ The Paneion is described as a grotto (σπήλαιον, ἀντρον) in Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 10. 3. *Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 3, iii. 10. 7: δοκεῖ μὲν Ἰορδάνου πηγή τοῦ Πανίου. Steph. Byz. s.v. Πανία. The mountain was called by the same name as the grotto, Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 17: ἐν ταῖς ὑπερείαις τοῦ καλοῦ-

Egyptian general Scopas the decisive victory, in consequence of which all Palestine fell into his hands.³⁸⁷ Even this early mention would lead us to infer a Hellenization of the place in the third century before Christ. In any case the population of the surrounding district, as its farther history also shows, was chiefly non-Jewish. In the early times of Herod the country of *Παριάς* (as it was called from the Pan-Grotto there) belonged to a certain Zenodorus, after whose death, in the year 20 B.C., it was given by Augustus to Herod (see above, § 15), who built a splendid temple to Augustus in the neighbourhood of the Pan-Grotto (*Antt.* xv. 10. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 21. 3). The place, which lay there, was originally called like the country, *Παριάς* or *Παρεάς*.³⁸⁸ It was first, however, transformed into a considerable town by Philip the Tetrarch, the son of Herod, who rebuilt it and called it *Καيسάρεια*, in honour of Augustus (*Antt.* xviii. 2. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 1). This refoundation belongs to the early times of Philip; for the coins of the town have an era, the commencement of which probably dates from the year 3 B.C. (751 A.U.C.), or at latest 2 B.C. (752 A.U.C.).³⁸⁹ After the death of Philip, his realm was for a few years under Roman administration, then under Agrippa I., then again under Roman procurators, and at last, in A.D. 53, under Agrippa II., who enlarged Caesarea and called it *Νερωινιάς* in honour of Nero (*Antt.* xv. 9. 4),

μένου Πανίου ὄρους (Τὸ Πάνειον is properly an adjective requiring as a complement either ἄντρον or ὄρος.

³⁸⁷ Polybius, xvi. 18, xxviii. 1.

³⁸⁸ *Παριάς* or *Παρεάς* is properly an adjective and indeed the fem. of *Πανείος* (as *ἀγριάς*, *λευκάς*, *ὄρειάς* are the poetic feminines of *ἀγριος*, *λευκός*, *ὄρειος*). Hence the same word serves to designate both the country (where *χώρα* is the complement, *Antt.* xv. 10. 3, xvii. 8. 1. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 1. Plinius, v. 18. 74: *Panias in qua Caesarea*) and the town or village (where *πόλις* or *κώμη* is the complement, *Antt.* xviii. 2. 1).

³⁸⁹ See Noris, iv. 5. 4 (ed. Lips. pp. 442-453). Eckhel, iii. 339-344. Sanclemente, *De vulgaris aerae emendatione* (Rome 1793), iii. 2, p. 322 sqq. The coins in Mionnet, v. 311-315; *Suppl.* viii. 217-220. De Saulcy, pp. 313-324, pl. xviii. The addition to the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, which transposes the foundation to the time of Tiberius, is of no value. See below, note 390. Also Jerome in the *Chronicle and Comment. on Matth.* xvi. 13 (see note 345).

which name is occasionally found on coins.³⁴⁰ That the town was then also chiefly a heathen one appears from Joseph. *Vita*, 13. Hence both Titus and Vespasian passed their times of repose during the Jewish war amidst games and other festivities at this place.³⁴¹ The name Neronias seems never to have been naturalized. In the first century after Christ this Caesarea was, to distinguish it from others, usually called *Καيسάρεια ἡ Φιλίππου*; ³⁴² its official designation upon coins, especially of the second century, is *Καισ(άρεια) Σεβ(αστή) ἱερ(ά) καὶ ἄσυ(λος) ὑπὸ Πανείω*.³⁴³ Elsewhere it has generally been called since the second century *Καيسάρεια Πανιάς*, which name also predominates on coins of the third.³⁴⁴ Since the fourth the name of Caesarea has been wholly lost, and the town called only Panias.³⁴⁵ This seems besides to have always remained its prevailing name among the native popu-

³⁴⁰ Mionnet, v. 315. De Saulcy, pp. 316, 318. Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage*, pp. 116, 117. The same, *Coins of the Jews*, pp. 145, 146.

³⁴¹ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iii. 9. 7, vii. 2. 1.

³⁴² Matt. xvi. 13; Mark viii. 27. Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 9. 4; *Bell. Jud.* iii. 9. 7, vii. 2. 1; *Vita*, 13.

³⁴³ See the literature cited in note 339, especially Mionnet and De Saulcy.

³⁴⁴ Ptolem. v. 15. 21, viii. 20. 12 (*Καيسάρεια Πανιάς*). *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4750 (upon the statue of Memnon at Thebes), and n. 4921 (at Philoe), both times *Καيسαρείας Πανιάδος*. Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscriptions*, vol. iii. n. 1620^b (at Aphrodisias in Caria in the second century after Christ) · *Καيسάρειαν Πανιάδα*. *Tabula Peutling.* (Caesareapaneas). *Geographus Ravennas*, edd. Pinder et Parthey, p. 85. The coins in De Saulcy, pp. 317, 322 sq.

³⁴⁵ Eusebius, who frequently mentions the town in the *Onomasticon*, always calls it *Πανεις* only (see the Index in Lagarde's edition). And this is generally its name in ecclesiastical literature; see Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* vii. 17, 18. Hieron. in *Jesaj.* xlii. 1 sqq., ed. Vallarsi, iv. 507 (in confinio Caesareae Philippi, quae nunc vocatur Paneas). Idem in *Ezek.* xxvii. 19, ed. Vall. v. 317 (ubi hodie Paneas, quae quondam Caesarea Philippi vocabatur); Idem in *Matt.* xvi. 13, ed. Vall. vii. 121 (in honorem Tiberii (sic!) Caesaris Caesaream, quae nunc Paneas dicitur, construxit). Sozom. v. 21. Philostorg. vii. 3 (comp. also Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iv. 546). Theodoret. *Quaest.* (see the passages in Reland, p. 919). Malalas, ed. Dindorf, p. 237. Glycas Theophanes (see the passages in Reland, p. 922). Photius, *Cod.* 271, *sub fin.* The Acts of the Councils (in Le Quien, *Oriens christianus*, ii. 831). Hierocles, *Synecd.*, ed. Parthey, p. 43. Theodosius, *De situ terrae sanctae*, § 13 (ed. Gildemeister 1882). On the supposed statue of Christ at Paneas, see also Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* i. 1. 85 sq.

lation,³⁴⁶ as it is also that chiefly used (in the form פְּנִיִּים) in Rabbinic literature.³⁴⁷ When the "villages of Caesarea Philippi" (αἱ κῶμαι Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου) are mentioned in the New Testament, Mark viii. 27, of course the genitive here expresses not a merely "local reference" of the villages to the town,³⁴⁸ but shows that they belong and are subject to it,—in other words, that Caesarea had, like each of these towns, a district of its own which it governed.

30. *Julias*, formerly *Bethsaida*.³⁴⁹ In the place of a village called Bethsaida, lying to the north of the Lake of Gennesareth, a new town was built by Philip, who called it Ἰουλιὰς, in honour of Julia the daughter of Augustus (*Antt.* xviii. 2. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 1). Its situation eastward of the Jordan, just before the latter flows into the Lake of Gennesareth, is placed beyond doubt by the repeated and concurrent statements of Josephus.³⁵⁰ The foundation of this city also must have taken place in the earlier times of Philip. For in the year 2 B.C. (752 A.U.C.) Julia had already been banished by Augustus to the island of Pandateria,³⁵¹ and it is not conceiv-

³⁴⁶ Comp. Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 17: ἐπὶ τῇς Φιλίππου Καισαρείας, ἥν Πανιάδα Φοίνικες προσαγορεύουσι.

³⁴⁷ Mishna, *Para* viii. 11; Tosefta, *Bechoroth* p. 542, 1, ed. Zuckermann (in both passages the "Grotto of Panias," מְעֵרַת פְּנִיִּים, is mentioned). Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 1752. Levy, *Chald. Wörterbuch*, ii. 273 sq. Lightfoot, *Centuria Matthæo præmissa*, c. 67 (*Opp.* ii. 220). Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, pp. 236–238. The corrupted form פְּנִיִּים does not belong to the usage of the living language, but in the first instance to a later text. In the passages cited from the Mishna the best authorities still have פְּנִיִּים (so *Aruch*, *Cod. de Rossi* 138, *Cambridge University Additional*, 470. 1). In *Aruch* this form only is everywhere quoted.

³⁴⁸ So Winer, *Grammatik*, § 30. 2.

³⁴⁹ See in general, Reland, pp. 653 sqq., 869. Raumer, p. 122. Winer, *s.v.* "Bethsaida." Kuhn, ii. 352. Robinson, ii. pp. 405, 406, iii. pp. 358, 359. Ritter, xv. 1. 278 sqq. Guérin, *Galilée*, i. 329–338. Furrer in the *Zeitsch. of the German Pal.-Vereins*, ii. 66–70.

³⁵⁰ See especially, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 10. 7; also *Antt.* xviii. 2. 1 (on the Lake of Gennesareth); *Vita*, 72 (near the Jordan); *Antt.* xx. 8. 4; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13. 2 (in Peraea). Also Plinius, *H. N.* v. 15. 71, mentions Julias on the eastern shore of the Lake of Gennesareth.

³⁵¹ Velleius, ii. 100. Dio Cassius, lv. 10. Comp. Sueton. *Aug.* 65. Tac. *Annal.* i. 53. Pauly's *Enc.* v. 844 sq. Lewin, *Fasti sacri* (1865), n. 961.

able, that Philip should, after that date, have named a town after her.³⁵² Of its subsequent history, nothing is known but that it was given by Nero to Agrippa II. (*Antt.* xx. 8. 4; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13. 2). It is mentioned in Pliny, Ptolemy and the geographers of Ravenna.³⁵³ From the manner in which Josephus speaks of it (*Antt.* xviii. 2. 1), it might appear as though Philip had only altered the name of the village of Bethsaida into Julias, and thus, that the new place too was only a *κώμη*.³⁵⁴ In another passage however he explicitly distinguishes Julias from the surrounding *villages* as a *πόλις*, hence the former was properly speaking a *πόλις* from the time of its rebuilding. The question as to whether the Bethsaida of the New Testament was identical with this—a question recently again decided in the affirmative³⁵⁵—must here be left undiscussed.

31. *Sepphoris*, *Σεπφώρις*.³⁵⁶ The Semitic form of this name fluctuates between *סֶפְפֹּרִי* and *סֶפְרִי*. Perhaps the former is the older, the latter the abbreviated form.³⁵⁷ With the

³⁵² So also Sanclemente, *De vulgaris aerae emendatione*, p. 327 sqq. Lewin, *Fasti sacri*, n. 953. The *Chronicle* of Eusebius erroneously places the foundation of Julias in the time of Tiberius; see below, note 390.

³⁵³ Plinius, v. 15. 71. Ptolem. v. 16. 4. *Geogr. Ravennas*, edd. Pinder et Parthey, p. 85.

³⁵⁴ *Antt.* xviii. 2. 1: *κώμην δὲ Βηθσαιῶδαν, πρὸς λίμνῃ δὲ τῇ Γεννησαρίτιδι, πόλεως παρασχὼν ἀξίωμα πλήθει τε οἰκητόρων καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ δυνάμει, Ἰουλίαν θυγατρί τῇ Καίσαρος ὁμῶνυμον ἐκάλεσεν.*

³⁵⁵ Holtzmann, *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.* 1878, p. 383 sq. Furrer in the *Zeitsch. of the German Päl.-Ver.* ii. 66–70. Against this identity, see especially Reland, Raumer and Winer, as above.

³⁵⁶ See in general, Reland, pp. 999–1003. Pauly's *Enc.* vi. 1. 1050. Raumer, p. 139. Kuhn, ii. 372. Robinson's *Palestine*, iii. 111, 112. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xvi. 748 sq. Guérin, *Galilée*, i. 369–376. *The Survey of Western Palestine*, *Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, i. 279 sq., 330–338; also sheet v. of the English map.

³⁵⁷ The place does not occur in the Old Testament, but very frequently, on the other hand, in Rabbinical literature. In the Mishna it is found in the four following places: *Kiddushin* iv. 5; *Baba mezia* viii. 8; *Baba bathra* vi. 7; *Arachin* ix. 6; very often in the Tosefta (see the Index in Zuckermann's edition). Comp. also Lightfoot, *Centuria Matthaeo prae-missa*, c. 82, 83 (*Opp.* ii. 229 sqq.). Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, ii. 1115. The orthography fluctuates between *סֶפְפֹּרִי* (or, which is the same, *סֶפְפֹּרִי*, *סֶפְפֹּרִי*) and *סֶפְרִי* (*סֶפְרִי*). The *Cod. de Rossi* 138 has in all the

former correspond the Greek and Latin *Σεπφουρίν*, Saphorim, Safforine;³⁵⁸ with the latter *Σαπφουρεί*, Saporì.³⁵⁹ Josephus constantly uses the Graecized form *Σεπφώρις*. On coins the inhabitants are called *Σεπφωρηνοί*.³⁶⁰ The earliest mention is found in Josephus in the beginning of the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, when Ptolemy Lathurus made an unsuccessful attempt to take Sepphoris by force (*Antt.* xiii. 12. 5). When Gabinius, about 57–55 B.C., divided the Jewish region into five “Synedria,” he transferred the Synedrium for Galilee to Sepphoris (*Antt.* xiv. 5. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 8. 5); which shows that this town must then have been the most important town of Galilee. It is also mentioned as a place of arms at the conquest of Palestine by Herod the Great, who was only able to take it without difficulty, because the garrison of Antigonus had evacuated the place (*Antt.* xiv. 15. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 16. 2). At the insurrection, after the death of Herod, Sepphoris seems to have been a main seat of the rebellion. Varus despatched thither a division of his army, burnt the town and sold its inhabitants as slaves (*Antt.* xvii. 10. 9; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 5. 1). This makes a turning-point in its history; from a Jewish town adhering to the national party it now became a town friendly to the Romans, with probably a mixed population. For Herod Antipas, to whose possession it was transferred, rebuilt it and made it “the

four places in the Mishna ציפורין; the Cambridge manuscript too (*University Additional*, 470. 1) has throughout the plural form. This also appears to be the prevailing form in the Jerusalemite Talmud (see the quotations in Lightfoot, as above). Elsewhere, on the contrary, צפורי predominates, especially in the Tosefta (according to Zuckermannel's edition).

³⁵⁸ *Σεπφουρίν*, Epiphan. *Haer.* 30. 11 (ed. Dindorf). Saphorim, *Hieronymus praef. in Jonam* (Vallarsi, vi. 390). Safforine, *Hieron. Onomast.*, ed. Lagarde, p. 88. In John xi. 54 the Greek and Latin text of the *Cod. Cantabr.* has the addition *Σαπφουρειν*, Sappurim, after *χώραν*.

³⁵⁹ *Σαπφουρεί*, Ptolem. v. 16. 4 (the Codex of Vatopedi has *Σαπφουρεί* without the addition ἢ *Σαπφουρίς*; see *Géographie de Ptolémée reproduction photolithographique*, etc., p. lviii.). Saporì, *Geographus Ravennas*, edd. Pinder et Parthey, p. 85.

³⁶⁰ See Eckhel, iii. 425. Mionnet, 482. De Sauley, p. 325 sq., pl. xvii n. 1–4.

ornament of all Galilee" (*Antt.* xviii. 2. 1): *πρόσχημα τοῦ Γαλιλαίου παντός*. But its population was—as was shown by its attitude during the great war, A.D. 66-70—no longer anti-Roman and hence no longer purely Jewish.^{360a} It is perhaps this change, which is referred to in a passage of the Mishna, in which the "ancient government of Sepphoris" is assumed to have been a purely Jewish one.³⁶¹ At its rebuilding by Herod Antipas, Sepphoris seems to have been also raised to the rank of capital of Galilee.³⁶²

^{360a} That it was however still chiefly Jewish is evident especially from *Bell. Jud.* iii. 2. 4: *προθύμους σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ὑπέσχοντο κατὰ τῶν ὁμοφύλων συμμάχους*.

³⁶¹ *Kiddushin* iv. 5. It is here said, that every one is to be esteemed an Israelite of pure blood, who can prove his descent from a priest or Levite, who has actually ministered as such, or from a member of the Sanhedrim; nay every one whose ancestors were known to have been public officials or almoners, in particular, according to Rabbi Jose, every *מי שהיה החום בארכי הישנה של ציפורין*. In explanation of this difficult passage we remark that *חָתוּם*, properly "sealed," is here equivalent to "confirmed, acknowledged, accredited by documents" (compare the use of *σφραγίζω*, *John* iii. 33, vi. 27). The word *עַר*, which the common text has after *חָתוּם*, must according to the best MSS. be expunged. *יִשְנָה = ἀρχή*. *יִשְנָה* is certainly not the local name *Jeshana* (for which older commentators have taken it), but the adjective "old." Hence two explanations are possible. Either—1. "Every one, who (with respect to his ancestors) was recognised in the old government of Sepphoris as a member thereof." It would then be assumed that all the members of the old government were Israelites of pure blood. Or 2. "Every one, who was acknowledged by the old government of Sepphoris," viz. as an Israelite of pure blood. In this case also the old government of Sepphoris would be assumed to consist of purely Israelitish officials. The first explanation seems to me to be preferable according to the context. It may certainly be questionable, when the ancient purely Jewish government of Sepphoris was replaced by another of mixed or heathen composition. This might have taken place in the time of Hadrian, when much may have been changed in consequence of the Jewish insurrection, at about which period also, it should be observed, Sepphoris received the new name of Diocaesarea (see below). According to all indications however, it seems to me probable, that Sepphoris so early as its rebuilding by Herod Antipas was no longer a purely Jewish town. Consider also the coins with the image of Trajan!

³⁶² Josephus says, *Antt.* xviii. 2. 1: *ἤγεν αὐτὴν αὐτοκρατορίδα*. This alone tells us nothing more than that he granted it its autonomy (*αὐτοκρατορίδα = αὐτόνομον*). But subsequent history makes it probable, that the rest of Galilee was then already subordinated to it. The explanation of *αὐτοκρα-*

This rank was however afterwards bestowed by the same prince upon the newly built city of Tiberias, to which Sepphoris was subordinate.³⁶³ It so continued until Tiberias was, in the reign of Nero, separated from Galilee and bestowed upon Agrippa II., when Sepphoris consequently again occupied the position of capital of Galilee.³⁶⁴ Thus these two towns alternately assumed the same position with respect to Galilee, that Jerusalem did with respect to Judaea (see below, § 2). Sepphoris was at that time the most important fortress in Galilee,³⁶⁵ and, after Tiberias, the largest town in the province.³⁶⁶ Hence, at the outbreak of the Jewish war, it was of the greatest consequence, that just this town did not participate in the insurrection, but remained from the beginning on the side of the Romans. So early as the time when Cestius Gallus marched against insurgent Jerusalem, Sepphoris took up a friendly position towards him.³⁶⁷ It remained also faithful to its Romish tendencies during the winter of A.D. 66/67, when Josephus was organizing the insurrection in Galilee.³⁶⁸

τορίς as capital can hardly be conceded. Some MSS. have αὐτοκράτορι, whence Dindorf conjectures: ἀνῆκεν αὐτὴν αὐτοκράτορι, "he dedicated it to the emperor."

³⁶³ *Vita*, 9, Justus said of Tiberias: ὡς ἡ πόλις ἐστὶν αἰεὶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ἄρξειεν δὲ ἐπὶ γε τῶν Ἡρώδου χρόνων τοῦ τετραρρχοῦ καὶ κτιστοῦ γενομένου, βουληθέντος αὐτοῦ τὴν Σεπφωριτῶν πόλιν τῇ Τιβερίῳ ὑπακοῦειν.

³⁶⁴ *Vita*, 9: ἄρξεια γὰρ εὐθύς τὴν μὲν Σεπφώριν, ἐπειδὴ Ῥωμαίοις ὑπήκουσε, τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

³⁶⁵ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 11: ἡ καρτερωτάτη τῆς Γαλιλαίας πόλις Σεπφώρις. Comp. *Bell. Jud.* iii. 2. 4. The ἀκρόπολις is mentioned *Vita*, 67. Comp. Mishna, *Arachin* ix. 6: צרר הישנה של ציפורין, "the old citadel of Sepphoris." Tosefta, *Shabbath*, p. 129, 27th ed. Zuckermann, שביצפורי.

³⁶⁶ *Vita*, 65 (ed. Bekker, p. 340, 32): τῶν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ πόλεων αἱ μεγίσται Σεπφώρις καὶ Τιβερίας. *Vita*, 45: εἰς Σεπφώριν, μεγίστην τῶν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ πόλιν. *Bell. Jud.* iii. 2. 4: μεγίστην μὲν οὖσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας πόλιν, ἐρμυνοτάτῃ δὲ ἐπεκτισμένην χαρίῃ. According to *Vita*, 25, Tiberias, Sepphoris and Gabara were the three largest towns of Galilee.

³⁶⁷ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 11.

³⁶⁸ Joseph. *Vita*, 8, 22, 25, 45, 65. Two passages indeed in the *Bell. Jud.* seem to contradict this: according to *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 6, Josephus committed to the Sepphorites themselves the charge of fortifying their town, because he found them in other respects "ready for war" (προθύμους ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον), i.e. against the Romans; and according to *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 7, Sepphoris, at the outbreak of the conflict between Josephus and the more

Josephus therefore took possession of it by force, in doing which he was unable to prevent its being plundered by his Galilaean troops.³⁶⁹ Cestius Gallus consequently sent a garrison to the oppressed town, by which Josephus was repulsed, when he for the second time entered it by force.³⁷⁰ Vespasian soon after arrived in Galilee with his army, and Sepphoris entreated and again received from him a Roman garrison.³⁷¹ We have but fragmentary information of the further history of the town. Its inhabitants are, on coins of Trajan, still called Σεπφωρηνοί. Soon after however it received the name of Diocaesarea, which appears on coins since Antoninus Pius. Its official designation upon coins is: Διοκαι(σάρεια) ἱερὰ ἄσ(υλος) καὶ αὐτό(νομος).³⁷² The name of Diocaesarea remained the prevailing one in Greek authors,³⁷³ though its original appellation continued to exist, and at last

fanatical war party, stood on the side of the latter. The true relation however between these two facts is seen from the more special statements of the *Vita*. The Sepphorites alleged their readiness to attach themselves to the cause of the revolution, solely for the purpose of keeping off from themselves the whole revolutionary party; and fortified their city not against, but for the Romans (see especially, *Vita*, 65). And when in the winter of 66/67 they had remained a long time without Roman protection, they were obliged to tack between the two revolutionary parties, which were mutually attacking each other, and as far as possible to take up a friendly position towards both (see *Vita*, 25, and especially, *Vita*, 45), to which circumstance what is said in *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 7 may be reduced.

³⁶⁹ *Vita*, 67.

³⁷⁰ *Vita*, 71. The remark, *Vita*, 15: δις μὲν κατὰ κράτος ἔλων Σεπφωρίτας, refers to this double capture of Sepphoris.

³⁷¹ *Vita*, 74; *Bell. Jud.* iii. 2. 4, 4. 1. The former garrison sent by Cestius Gallus had meantime either withdrawn or was now replaced or strengthened by the troops of Vespasian.

³⁷² See on the coins in general, Noris, v. 6, *fin.* (ed. Lips. 562-564). Eckhel, iii. 425 sq. Mionnet, v. 482 sq.; *Suppl.* viii. 331 sq. De Saulcy, pp. 325-330, pl. xvii. n. 1-7. On a supposed coin of Seleucus I. (Nikator), Eckhel, iii. 426. Mionnet, v. 4. On the identity of Sepphoris and Diocaesarea, Epiphan. *Haer.* 30. 11, *fin.* Hieronymus, *Onomast.*, ed. Lagarde, p. 88. Idem, *præfat. in Jonam* (Vallarsi, vi. 390). Hegesippus, *De bello Jud.* i. 30. 7.

³⁷³ Eusebius, in *Onomast.*, calls the town exclusively Διοκαισάρεια (see the Index in Lagarde). Compare also, beside the literature cited in the preceding note, Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* ii. 33. Sozom. *Hist. eccl.* iv. 7. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. Bonnens, i. 61. Cedrenus, ed. Bekker, i. 524. Le Quien, *Oriens christ.* iii. 714.

banished the new one.³⁷⁴ The district of Diocaesarea was so extensive, that it included *e.g.* the village of Dabira on Mount Tabor.³⁷⁵

32. *Julias* or *Livias*.³⁷⁶ In the Old Testament, a place called Beth-haram (בֵּית הָרָם or בֵּית הָרֶן), in the country east of the Jordan, in the realm of the Amorite kings of Hesbon, is mentioned (Josh. xiii. 27; Num. xxxii. 36). In the Jerusalemite Talmud בית רמתה is stated to be the more modern name of this Beth-haram;³⁷⁷ and both Eusebius and Jerome identify the scriptural Beth-haram with the Βηθραμφθά or Bethramtha, which was known to them.³⁷⁸ The Βηθαράμαθος, where Herod the Great had a palace, which was destroyed during the insurrection after his death, is at any rate identical with the latter.³⁷⁹ It was this very Bethramphtha, which was rebuilt and fortified by Herod Antipas, and called *Julias* in honour of the wife of Augustus (Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 2. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 1). Eusebius and others give the name as *Livias* instead of *Julias*,³⁸⁰ and the town is elsewhere frequently mentioned by this

³⁷⁴ On the continued use of the name Sepphoris, see above, notes 357–359. The place is still called Sefurije.

³⁷⁵ Euseb. *Onomast.* p. 250: Δαβειρά . . . ἐν τῇ ὁρεὶ Θαβάρ, ἐν ὁρίοις Διοκαισαρείας, Gabatha, the present Jabata, about 7–8 mil. pass. from Diocaesarea, also belonged to its district. See above, note 302.

³⁷⁶ See in general, Reland, pp. 642, 874. Pauly's *Enc.* iv. 1107. Winer, *RWB.* i. 171 (*s.v.* "Beth-haram"). Raumer, p. 260. Ritter, xv. 538, 573, 1186. Seetzen, *Reisen*, iv. 224 sq. Riehm's *Wörterb.* *s.v.* Beth-haram. Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerl. Verfassung*, ii. 352 sq. Id. *Ueber die Entstehung der Städte der Alten* (1878), p. 426. Tuch, *Quaestiones de Flavii Josephi libris historicis* (1859), pp. 7–11.

³⁷⁷ *Jer. Shebiith* 38^d (on Mishna, *Shebiith* ix. 2; see the passage also in Reland, pp. 306–308). Peraea is here divided into three parts, according to its physical conditions of mountain, plain, and valley (הר, שפלה, and עמק). In the mountainous part lies *e.g.* Machaerus, in the plain Hesbon, in the valley בית הר and בית נמרה. בית רמתה and בית נמון are then stated to be the more modern names of these last two places. In the Tosefta (p. 71, 22rd ed. Zuckerman) the two places are called בית נמרה רמתה. Has the בית been here omitted before רמתה, or could the place have been called simply רמתה?

³⁷⁸ Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lagarde, p. 234. Hieronymus, *ibid.* p. 103.

³⁷⁹ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 4. 2. In the parallel passage, *Antt.* xvii. 10. 6, the name is corrupted. Instead of ἐν Ἀμαθοῖς, as the traditional text has it, we must read either ἐν Ἀραμαθοῖς (with the omission of Beth, so Tuch, *Quaestiones*, etc., p. 10) or just ἐν Βηθαραμαθοῖς.

³⁸⁰ Euseb. *Onomast.* p. 234: Βηθραμφθά . . . αὐτὴ δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ οὖν καλου-

name.³⁸¹ Since the wife of Augustus was called by her own name Livia during his lifetime, and did not bear the name of Julia till she was admitted into the *gens Julia* by his testament,³⁸² we must conclude that Livias was the older name of the town, and that this was after the death of Augustus altered into that of Julias; but that this new official appellation was, as in the case of Caesarea Philippi and Neronias, unable to banish the older and already nationalized name. Only Josephus uses the official designation Julias. He still mentions the town by this name at the time of the Jewish war, when it was occupied by Placidus, a general of Vespasian.³⁸³ The situation of the town is most accurately described by Theodosius, the Palestinian pilgrim (sixth century), and after him by Gregory of Tours: it lay beyond Jordan, opposite

μὲν Διβιάς, Hieronymus, *ibid.* p. 103: Bethramtha . . . ab Herode in honorem Augusti Libias cognominata. Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene, ii. 148 sq.: Herodes Tiberiadem condidit et *Liviadem* (according to Jerome, also the Armenian). *Synecd.*, ed. Dindorf, i. 605: 'Ἡρώδης ἔκτισε Τιβερίάδα εἰς ὄνομα Τιβερίου Καίσαρος, ὁ αὐτὸς Διβιάδα.

³⁸¹ Plinius, *H. N.* xiii. 4. 44. Ptolemaeus, v. 16. 9 (Διβιάς according to the Cod. of Vatopedi). Euseb. in *Onomast.* frequently. Hierocles, *Synecd.*, ed. Parthey, p. 44. The *Notitia episcopat.*, the same, p. 144. The Acts of the Councils (Le Quien, *Oriens christ.* iii. 655 sq.). The *Vita S. Joannis Silentiarii* (in the *Acta Sanctorum*, see the passage in Reland, p. 874). *Geographus Ravennas*, ed. Pinder et Parthey, p. 84 (Liviada as nominat.). Theodosius, *De situ terrae sanctae*, § 65, ed. Gildemeister, 1882 (Liviada as nominat.). Gregor. Turon. *De gloria martyri.* i. 18. On the nominative formation Liviada, see Rönisch, *Italia und Vulgata*, p. 258 sq.

³⁸² On the testament of Augustus, see Tacit. *Annal.* i. 8: Livia in familiam Juliam nomenque Augustum adsumebatur. The name Julia for Livia is found in authors (see e.g. Tacit. *Annal.* i. 14, v. 1. Sueton. *Calig.* 16; Dio Cassius, lvi. 46. Plinius, *H. N.* x. 55. 154. Joseph. frequently), and upon coins and inscriptions. See Pauly's *Enc.* iv. 484, 1116 Palestinian coins of Julia, see in Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage*, pp. 141–151. The same, *Coins of the Jews* (1881), pp. 177–182.

³⁸³ *Bell. Jud.* iv. 7. 6, 8. 2. The town is not elsewhere mentioned by Josephus. For in *Antt.* xx. 8. 4, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13. 2, it is certainly Julias = Bethsaida, which is intended; and in *Antt.* xiv. 1. 4, Διβιάς is probably the same place, which is called Δέμβαι in *Antt.* xiii. 15. 4, where it is questionable which form is correct. Comp. Tuch, as above, pp. 11, 14. The Δουιάς of Strabo, p. 763, which also lay in the same district, and is distinct from Livias, might also be compared, since it existed in the time of Pompey.

Jericho, 12 *m. p.* from that town, in the neighbourhood of the warm springs.³⁸⁴ With this Eusebius, who places it opposite Jericho on the road to Hesbon, coincides.³⁸⁵ Its cultivation of dates is as much celebrated by Theodosius as by Pliny.³⁸⁶

33. *Tiberias*, *Τιβεριάς*.³⁸⁷ The most important work of Herod the Great was the building of a new capital on the western shore of the Lake of Gennesareth, which he called *Τιβεριάς* in honour of the Emperor Tiberius. It was situated in a beautiful and fertile district in the neighbourhood of celebrated warm springs (*Antt.* xviii. 2. 3; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 1; compare above, § 17^b).³⁸⁸ Its building took place considerably after that of Sepphoris and Livias. For while Josephus mentions the building of these two cities at the very beginning of the reign of Herod Antipas, he does not speak of the building of Tiberias till the entrance of Pilate upon his office (A.D. 26); see *Antt.* xviii. 2. 1-3. This makes it probable,

³⁸⁴ Theodosius, *De situ terrae sanctae* (ed. Gildemeister, 1882), § 65: *Civitas Liviada trans Jordanem, habens de Hiericho milia xii. . . . ibi aquae calidae sunt, ubi Moyses lavit, et in ipsis aquis calidis leprosi curantur.* Greg. Turon. *De gloria martyrum*, i. 18: *Sunt autem et ad Levidam (elsewhere Leviadem) civitatem aquae calidae . . . ubi similiter leprosi mundantur; est autem ab Hiericho duodecim millia.*

³⁸⁵ Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lagarde, pp. 213, 216, 233. Comp. also the passage from the *Vita S. Joannis Silentiarii* in Reland, p. 874. The data furnished are sufficient for an approximate determination of the locality, but there is as yet no certain foundation for more accurately fixing it.

³⁸⁶ Plinius, *H. N.* xiii. 4. 44 (see above, note 332). Theodosius, *l.c.*: *ibi habet dactulum nicolaum majorem; also the note of Gildemeister.*

³⁸⁷ See in general, Reland, pp. 1036-1042. Raumer, p. 142 sq. Winer, *RWB. s.v.* Robinson's *Palestine*, ii. p. 380 sq., iii. p. 342 sq. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv. 315-322. Bäder-Socin, pp. 382-387. Sepp, *Jerusalem*, ii. 188-209. Guérin, *Galilée*, i. 250-264. *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, i. 361 sq., 379, 418-420; also sheet vi. of the large English chart.

³⁸⁸ On the warm springs, see Plinius, *H. N.* v. 15. 71: *Tiberiade aquis calidis salubri.* Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 2. 3; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 6, iv. 1. 3; *Vita*, 16. Mishna, *Shabbath* iii. 4, xxii. 5; *Negaim* ix. 1; *Machshirin* vi. 7. Tosefta, *Shabbath*, p. 127, 21st ed. Zuckermann. Antoninus Martyr, c. 7. in *civitatem Tiberiadem, in qua sunt thermae salsae.* Jakubi (9th cent.), translated in the *Zeitsch. d. deutschen Pal.-Verein*, iv. 87 sq. The present Tiberias lies about 40 minutes north of the springs; and there is no reason for transferring the former situation of the town elsewhere. For the

that Tiberias was not built till A.D. 26 or later.³⁸⁹ Eusebius in his *Chronicle* decidedly places the building in the 14th year of Tiberius; but this statement is quite without chronological value.³⁹⁰ Unfortunately the era of the town occurring upon the coins of Trajan and Hadrian cannot be calculated with certainty. It appears however, that the dates of the coins do not contradict the conjecture arrived at from Josephus.³⁹¹ The population of Tiberias was a very mixed

opinion of Furrer (*Zeitsch. d. DPV.* ii. 54), that the ancient Tiberias lay so close to the springs, "that they were enclosed within the walls of the town," rests upon a mistaken view of Joseph. *Vita*, 16; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 6. See on the other hand, *Antt.* xviii. 2. 3; *Bell. Jud.* iv. 1. 3. (The *ἡ Τιβεριάδης* in the two former passages means only "in the district of Tiberias;" thus also e.g. in Steph. Byz., ed. Meineke, p. 366: *Κάστριον, ὅρος ἐν Ἀσπένδῳ τῆς Παμφυλίας*; p. 442: *ἵστοι καὶ ἐν Κυζίκῳ κώμῃ Μίλισσα*; comp. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. 1881, p. 16, note 5. In the Old Test. also *בְּאַשְׁדּוֹד*=in the district of Ashdod.) The place where the springs were was called *Ἐμμανοῦς* (*Antt.* xviii. 2. 3) or *Ἀμμανοῦς* (*Bell. Jud.* iv. 1. 3), Hebrew *עֲמָנוּה*, *Jer. Erubin* v. 22^d below; Tosefta, *Erubin* p. 146, 5th ed. Zuckermann. Comp. also Lightfoot, *Centuria Matthaeo praemissa*, c. 74 (*Opp.* ii. 244 sq.). Hamburger, *Real-Encyklop. für Bibel und Talmud*, 2nd Div., art. "Heilbäder."

³⁸⁹ So also Lewin, *Fasti sacri* (London 1866), n. 1163.

³⁹⁰ Eusebius, *Chron.*, ed. Schoene, ii. 146-149 relates the building of new towns by the sons of Herod in the following order: Philip built Caesarea and Julias, Herod Antipas built Tiberias and Livias. All the buildings are placed in the time of Tiberius. Sepphoris is entirely passed over. All this puts it beyond doubt, that the statements of Eusebius are entirely derived from Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 1. For the buildings are there enumerated in exactly the same order, also after the accession of Tiberius, and with the same omission of Sepphoris. Hence the statements of Eusebius are not only without independent value, but are besides derived from the more inaccurate statement of Josephus in the *Bell. Jud.*, and ignore his more accurate account in *Antt.* xviii. 2. 1-3.

³⁹¹ On the coins and the era, see Noris, v. 6 (ed. Lips. pp. 552-564). Sanclemente, *De vulgaris aerae emendatione*, p. 324 sq. Huber in the *Wiener Numismatische Zeitsch.*, 1st year, 1869, pp. 404-414. De Saulcy, pp. 333-338, pl. xvii. n. 9-14. The same, in the *Annuaire de la Société Française de Numismatique et d'Archéol.* iii. 266-270. Among the dated coins only those of Trajan with the date 81 and those of Hadrian with the date 101 are attested with certainty. Noris and Sanclemente assume also coins of Trajan with the year 101, and accordingly calculate the epoch of Tiberias to be A.D. 17 (then the year in which Hadrian succeeded Trajan, i.e. A.D. 117=101 era of Tiberius, and A.D. 17=1 era of Tiberius). But the coins with the year 101 certainly all belong to Hadrian. Other coins too

one. To obtain inhabitants for his new town Herod Antipas was obliged to settle there, partly by compulsion, a real *colluvies hominum* (see above, § 17^b). Its attitude however during the Jewish war shows them to have been chiefly Jewish. The constitution however was one of Hellenistic organization.³⁹² The town had a council (βουλή) of 600 members,³⁹³ at the head of which was an ἄρχων³⁹⁴ and a committee of the δέκα πρότοι,³⁹⁵ also

given singly by numismatists (De Saulcy gives coins of Claudius with the year 33, of Trajan with 80, and of Hadrian with 103) are also doubtful. Hence all that can with certainty be affirmed is, that the epoch of Tiberias cannot begin earlier than A.D. 17. The consideration, that Tiberias was probably in the possession of Agrippa II. till A.D. 100, and hence could not previously have issued imperial coins, leads somewhat farther. Under this assumption the epoch could not on account of the coins of Trajan of 81 be placed earlier than A.D. 19. A still further point of contact might be obtained, if the title, which Trajan bears upon the coins of 81, could be certainly determined. For if he is on these called only *Germanicus* and not *Dacicus*, the coins in question could not have been issued later than A.D. 103 (after which year Trajan bore also the latter title), and consequently the epoch could not begin later than A.D. 22 (so Eckhel). If however in the reverse case he has just upon these coins both titles (as Reichardt asserts in Huber's above-named work, reading ΓΕΡ. Δ. instead of ΓΕΡΜ), the coins could not have been issued earlier than 103, nor the epoch begin before A.D. 22. This would be in accordance with Josephus.

³⁹² See on what follows, Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerl. Verfassung*, ii. 353. The same, *Ueber die Entstehung der Städte der Alten*, p. 427 sq.

³⁹³ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 9. Comp. in general, *Vita*, 12, 34, 55, 58, 61, 68.

³⁹⁴ *Vita*, 27, 53, 54, 57; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 3. One Jesus the son of Sapphias, is here throughout named as archon of Tiberias during the time of the revolt. Among his offices was that of presiding at the meeting of the council.

³⁹⁵ *Vita*, 13, 57; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 9 = *Vita*, 33. See especially, *Vita*, 13: τοὺς τῆς βουλῆς πρώτους δέκα. *Vita*, 57: τοὺς δέκα πρώτους Τιβερίαν. On these δέκα πρότοι, so frequently occurring in the Hellenistic communities, see Kuhn, i. 55; Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, i. 213 sq (1881); the Index to the *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* p. 35. They were not perhaps the oldest or the most respected members of the council, but a changing committee of it with definite official functions, as the frequently occurring formula δεκαπρωτεύσας shows (see *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 2639, 2929, 2930. Add. 2930^b, 3490, 3491, 3496, 3498, 4289, 4415^b. δεκαπρωτευνώς, n. 3418). Their chief office was the collection of taxes, for the due payment of which they were answerable with their private property, *Digest.* lib. iv. 1. 1: Munerum civilium quaedam sunt patrimonii, alia personarum. Patrimonii sunt munera rei vehicularis, item navicularis decemprimitas: ab istis enim periculo ipsorum exactiones solemnium celebrantur. *Digest.* lib. iv. 18.

Hyparchoi³⁹⁶ and an Agoranomos.³⁹⁷ It was also promoted to be the capital of Galilee, Sepphoris itself being subordinated to it (see above, p. 139). The coins of Tiberias issued in the time of Herod have simply the superscription *Τιβεριάς*.³⁹⁸ After the deposition of Herod Antipas Tiberias was transferred to the possession of Agrippa I. A coin of his time also, with the superscription *Τιβεριέων* is known.³⁹⁹ After the death of Agrippa the town came under the authority of the Roman procurators of Judaea. It must at the same time have received new political privileges or experienced some kind of favour from the Emperor Claudius; for the inhabitants are constantly called *Τιβεριεῖς Κλαυδιεῖς* on the coins of Trajan and Hadrian.⁴⁰⁰ It continued to maintain its position as capital of Galilee till the time of Nero (Joseph. *Vita*, 9). By him, probably in A.D. 61, it was bestowed upon Agrippa II., and thus separated from Galilee (*Antt.* xx. 8. 4; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13. 2; *Vita*, 9).⁴⁰¹ Hence it formed part of the realm of Agrippa, when the Jewish insurrection broke out in A.D. 66. The attitude of the population with respect to it was a very varying one. Some desired to remain on the side of Agrippa and the Romans; others—and indeed the mass of those without property—wished to join the cause of the revolution; others again took up a position of reserve (*Vita*, 9; comp. also

26: *Mixta munera decaprotiae et icosaprotiae, ut Herennius Modestinus . . . decrevit: nam decaproti at icosaproti tributa exigentes et corporale ministerium gerunt et pro omnibus defunctorum (?) fiscalia detrimenta resarciunt.* It is worthy of notice, that Josephus during his government of Galilee delivers to the *decem primi* at Tiberias *valuables* of King Agrippa, and makes them responsible for them, *Vita*, 13, 57.

³⁹⁶ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 6: τοῖς κατὰ τὴν πόλιν ὑπάρχουσιν.

³⁹⁷ *Antt.* xviii. 6. 2. On the office of the ἀγορανόμος, see Westermann in Pauly's *Enc.* i. 1 (2nd ed.), pp. 582–584. Stephanus, *Theos.* s.v. The material furnished by inscriptions in the Index to the *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* p. 32.

³⁹⁸ Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage*, pp. 97, 98. The same, *Coins of the Jews* (1881), pp. 119, 120.

³⁹⁹ Madden, *History*, p. 110; *Coins of the Jews*, p. 138.

⁴⁰⁰ See the literature cited above, especially De Saulcy.

⁴⁰¹ On the time, see above, § 19, Appendix 2.

Vita, 12, where the revolutionary party is called ἡ τῶν ναυτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀπόρων στάσις). This party had decidedly the upper hand, and the rest had consequently to submit. A chief leader of this party was Jesus the son of Sapphias, then archon of the town.⁴⁰² Still even after the triumph of the revolutionary torrent, a part of the population maintained their relations to Agrippa, and repeatedly entreated, though in vain, his support.⁴⁰³ When Vespasian had subjected the greater part of Galilee and penetrated as far as Tiberias, the town ventured no resistance, but voluntarily opened its gates and begged for pardon, which was granted out of regard for Agrippa. Vespasian indeed allowed his soldiers to march into Tiberias, but spared the town and restored it to Agrippa.⁴⁰⁴ It remained in his possession probably till his death, A.D. 100, till which period it did not again come under direct Roman rule, to which circumstance extant coins of the time of Trajan and Hadrian bear testimony.⁴⁰⁵ Eusebius designates it as a πόλις ἐπίσημος.⁴⁰⁶ It was in the third and fourth centuries after Christ a chief seat of Rabbinical scholarship, and is hence frequently mentioned in Talmudic literature.⁴⁰⁷

Of some of the last-named towns, as Antipatris, Phasaelis, Julias and Livias it cannot certainly be determined whether they really belonged to the class of independent towns with Hellenistic constitutions, since it is just as likely that, like other second-rate towns, they were incorporated in the general organization of the country. They had however to be named here, because in any case a certain proportion of the towns built by Herod and his sons belonged to the above category.

⁴⁰² Joseph. *Vita*, 12, 27, 53, 54, 57; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 3, iii. 9. 7-8. The revolutionary attitude of the town is plainly seen throughout the whole narrative of Josephus in his *Vita*.

⁴⁰³ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 8-10; *Vita*, 32-34, 68-69, 70.

⁴⁰⁴ *Bell. Jud.* iii. 9. 7-8.

⁴⁰⁵ A coin of the time of Commodus has been published by Huber in the *Wiener Numismatischen Zeitschr.* Jahrg. i. 1869, p. 401 sqq.

⁴⁰⁶ *Onomast.*, ed. Lagarde, p. 215.

⁴⁰⁷ Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, pp. 208-214. Pinner, *Compendium des jerus. und bab. Talmud* (1832), pp. 109-116.

On the other hand, it is also possible, that the number of the independent communities is not exhausted by the towns here enumerated. *Hence we cannot look upon the list we have given as a strictly defined one.* For the times of Roman imperialism a further number of independent civic communities would have to be named, which are here designedly passed over, because it was not till later (at the earliest A.D. 70) that they attained this position. This was the case especially with Nicopolis (= Emmaus), Neapolis (= Sichem), Diospolis (= Lydda), Eleutheropolis and the communities belonging to the province of Arabia, as Bostra, Adraa and others. Aelia Capitolina (= Jerusalem) too would have to be mentioned as a heathen town for the period after Hadrian. On Capitolias, comp. above, p. 106.

Concerning the position of the Jews in these mainly heathen communities no further material exists than what has been already communicated on the places in question. The history of Caesarea (No. 9) is the most instructive. Here heathens and Jews possessed down to Nero's time equal civic rights (*ἰσοπολιτεία*, *Antt.* xx. 8. 7 and 9) and hence equal eligibility to the town senate. As this of necessity entailed manifold dissensions, both parties strove to bring about an alteration of this state of things, each desiring to have the supremacy. Thus a threefold possibility existed: 1. equality, 2. exclusion of the Jews, and 3. exclusion of the heathen, from civic privileges. All three cases actually occurred. In the old Philistinian and Phoenician towns the Jews hardly possessed the privilege of citizenship. They dwelt in them indeed by thousands; but were only tolerated as inhabitants; and how strained were the relations between them and the heathen citizens, is best shown by the sanguinary persecution of the Jews in many of these towns at the outbreak of Jewish revolution, as *e.g.* in Ascalon, Ptolemais and Tyre. In other towns heathen and Jews may have been on an equality; this was especially the case in those towns, which subsequently to the Maccabaeian period were mainly inhabited by Jews, as Jamnia and Joppa.

Whether heathens were excluded from civic rights in any of the hitherto named towns is very doubtful; and not probable even in Sepphoris and Tiberias. The third possibility is at all events represented by Jerusalem and in general by the towns of the strictly Jewish territory. Particulars cannot be further entered into from lack of material. It must suffice to have established the general point of sight. On the organization of the Jewish communities in these towns, see below, § 27. II. and § 31. II.—III.

II. THE STRICTLY JEWISH TERRITORY.

THE LITERATURE.

- Selden, *De synedriis et praefecturis juridicis veterum Ebraeorum*, lib. i. Londini 1650, lib. ii. Londini 1653, lib. iii. Londini 1655 (reprint of the whole work, *Amstelodami* 1679). The first book treats of the judicial institutions of the Jews *ante legis in Sinai dationem*, the second of these same institutions subsequent to the giving of the law at Sinai, while the third is specially devoted to the consideration of the prerogatives of the supreme court (the Sanhedrim). In spite of all its critical shortcomings this learned work is still valuable on account of the rich fund of material it contains.
- Saalschütz, *Das mosaische Recht*, vol. i. 1853, pp. 53–64.
- Winer, *Realwörterb.*, arts. *Alter*, *Aelteste*; *Gericht*; *Städte*.
- Schenkel's *Bibellexicon*, arts. *Aelteste* (by Schenkel); *Gerichte* (by Wittichen); *Städte* (by Furrer).
- Riehm's *Handwörterb. des bibl. Altertums*, arts. *Aelteste*; *Gerichtswesen*; *Dorf*; *Stadt*.
- Arnold in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. xiv. p. 721 (art. *Städte*).
- Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. xv. p. 324 f. (art. *Synedrium*).
- Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerl. Verfassung des römischen Reichs*, vol. ii. pp. 336–346.
- Köhler, *Lehrbuch der biblischen Geschichte Alten Testaments*, vol. i. 1875, p. 350 f.
- Reuss, *Gesch. der heiligen Schriften A. T.'s*, sec. cxiv.

The strictly Jewish territory—leaving Samaria out of view—consisted of the three provinces of Judaea, Galilee and Peraea, and was enclosed within such boundaries as would naturally be formed by the contiguous portions of the districts belonging to the surrounding Hellenistic towns (comp. above, § 23. I.). The Gentile element in those provinces never

formed more at the very outside than a minority of the population, while we may venture to assume that, in the towns, the municipal councils were composed exclusively of Jews. For there cannot be a doubt that, in Jewish towns as well, there were civic representative bodies to whom the management of the public affairs of the community was entrusted. So far back even as the earliest period in the history of Israel we find frequent mention of "the elders of the city" (זִקְנֵי הָעִיר) in the capacity of local authorities (see in general, Deut. xix. 12, xxi. 2 ff., xxii. 15 ff., xxv. 7 ff.; Josh. xx. 4; Judg. viii. 14; Ruth iv. 2 ff.; 1 Sam. xi. 3, xvi. 4, xxx. 26 ff.; 1 Kings xxi. 8, 11). Of how many members this body was composed we are hardly ever told, but their number must have been something considerable. In Succoth, for example, there were as many as seventy-seven (Judg. viii. 14). Those officials represented the community in every department of its affairs and accordingly they were also called upon to act in the capacity of judges (see, for example, Deut. xxii. 15). But, besides these, "judges" (שֹׁפְטִים) and "officers" (שָׂטָרִים) are also specially mentioned (both classes in Deut. xvi. 18; while in 2 Chron. xix. 5 ff. the instituting of "judges" is ascribed to Jehoshaphat). Now seeing that the judges are expressly mentioned along with the elders (Deut. xxi. 2; Ezra x. 14), the two orders of officials are in any case to be regarded as distinct, but probably only to this extent, that the judges were those among the elders to whom the administration of justice was specially entrusted. Similarly the "officers" are also to be regarded as belonging to the number of the "elders," their special function again being to take charge of the executive department.⁴⁰⁸ The organization then that existed in later times is to be assumed as having been substantially identical with the one here in question. We further find that the "elders" of the city are also frequently mentioned during the Persian and Greek era (Ezra x. 14; Judith vi. 16, 21, vii. 23 viii. 10, x. 6, xiii. 12). As regards the Roman

⁴⁰⁸ See in particular, Knobel's notes on Ex. v. 6 and Deut. xvi. 18,

period again, we have evidence of the existence of local tribunals at that time in such a statement, for example, as that of Josephus, where he mentions that Albinus, actuated by greed, liberated for a money consideration certain individuals who, for the crime of robbery, had been sentenced to imprisonment by their respective *local courts* (*βουλῇ*).⁴⁰⁹ From what is here stated we can further gather that it was the *βουλῇ* itself that discharged the judicial functions. Still it is quite possible that in the larger towns especially there may have been, besides the *βουλῇ*, certain other courts of a special kind. Again it is the local Sanhedrims that are to be understood as referred to when, in Matt. x. 17 = Mark xiii. 9, it is stated that the believers would be delivered *εἰς συνέδρια*; we may also regard as belonging to the same category those courts that, in Matt. v. 22, are assumed to be inferior in point of jurisdiction to the high court of the Sanhedrim; and similarly with regard to the *πρεσβύτεροι* of Capernaum (Luke vii. 3). But it is in the Mishna above all that the existence of local courts throughout the country of the Jews is presupposed from beginning to end.⁴¹⁰ As regards the number of members of which such courts were composed, some have been disposed to infer from the Mishna that the most inferior ones consisted of not more than three persons. This however is based upon a pure misapprehension. For the passages appealed to in support of this view do nothing more than simply enumerate the various questions for the deciding of which and the various causes for the trying of which three persons were deemed sufficient. Thus three, for example, were considered sufficient to decide an action

⁴⁰⁹ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 1: καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ ληστείας δεδεμένους ὑπὸ τῆς παρ ἐκάστοις βουλῆς ἢ τῶν προτέρων ἐπιτρόπων ἀπελύτρον τοῖς συγγενεῖσι.

⁴¹⁰ *Shebi'ith* x. 4: The terms of the Prosbol-formula were substantially as follows: "I so and so declare before you THE JUDGES OF SUCH AND SUCH A PLACE that I," etc. *Sota* i. 3: How is the husband (of a woman suspected of adultery) to proceed? He is to bring her before the *local court*, which will assign him two lawyers, etc. *Sanhedrin* xi. 4: A criminal of that sort is tried and executed neither by the court belonging to his own town nor by the court at Jabne, etc.,

involving money, or to pronounce judgment in cases of robbery and assault, or to award damages and such like;⁴¹¹ this number was also sufficient to sentence any one to be scourged, to determine the date of the new moon, and decide as to the intercalary year;⁴¹² also for the laying on of the hands (upon a sin-offering offered in the name of the congregation), and for breaking the heifer's neck (on the occasion of any person being found murdered). Further cases for the disposal of which only three judges were necessary were those connected with the Chaliza and the refusal of a man to marry the wife of his deceased brother (Deut. xxv. 7-9), the redemption of the produce of fruit trees during the first four years of their growth, the redemption of the second tithe the value of which had not been previously determined, the purchasing back of certain things that were holy to the Lord, and so on.⁴¹³ But nowhere is it said, that there were distinct local courts consisting of only three persons. In what sense we are to understand the statements of the Mishna above referred to may be readily seen from another passage⁴¹⁴ which runs thus: "Actions involving money are decided by three persons. That is to say, each of the two parties in the case chooses a judge and then both the parties or, according to another view, both the judges, choose a third to act along with them." As matter of fact the most subordinate of the local courts consisted of seven persons. For one can scarcely be far wrong in assuming that the statement of Josephus to the effect that Moses ordained that "seven men were to bear rule in every city, and that two men of the tribe of Levi were to be appointed to act as officers in every court," was intended to be regarded as a description of the state of things that existed in Josephus' own time, for there is no mention of anything of this kind in the Pentateuch.⁴¹⁵ This is

⁴¹¹ *Sanhedrin* i. 1.

⁴¹² *Sanhedrin* i. 2. Comp. *Rosh hashana* ii. 9, iii. 1.

⁴¹³ *Sanhedrin* i. 3.

⁴¹⁴ *Sanhedrin* iii. 1.

⁴¹⁵ *Antt.* iv. 8. 14. ἀρχέτωσαν δὲ καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν ἄνδρες ἑπτὰ . . . ἑκάστη δὲ ἀρχῇ δύο ἄνδρες ὑπηρέται διδόνθωσαν ἐκ τῆς τῶν Λευιτῶν φυλῆς

corroborated by the fact that Josephus himself, when on one occasion he wanted to introduce a model Jewish constitution into Galilee, established a court with seven judges in every town.⁴¹⁶ No doubt from this latter circumstance one might rather infer that this organization had had no existence in Galilee previous to the revolution. But the boast of Josephus, that he was the first to create this the ideal of a Jewish constitution, may be said to be true only to this extent, that he took steps to have it more rigidly put in force. In the Talmud too we find "the seven leading men of the city" (שבעה טובי העיר) referred to on one occasion as forming a public board which, among other things, was entrusted with the management of the financial affairs of the community.⁴¹⁷ What Josephus has stated with regard to two Levites being always appointed to act as ὑπηρέται to the local courts (see above note 415) is not without its analogies at least in the Old Testament.⁴¹⁸ According to the Mishna there were certain special cases in which it was necessary to have priests as judges.⁴¹⁹ In the more populous places the local courts would appear to have been composed of twenty-three members. At least we find a statement in the Mishna to the effect that an inferior Sanhedrim (סנהדרין קטנה) consisted of twenty-three

Again in reproducing the law with regard to restitution (Ex. xxii. 6 ff.), Josephus presupposes the existence of courts with seven judges, *Antt.* iv. 8. 38: εἰ δὲ μηδὲν ἐπίβουλον ὄρων ὁ πιστευθεὶς ἀπολέσειεν, ἀφικόμενος ἐπὶ τοῦς ἑπτὰ κριτὰς ὁμνῶν τὸν θεόν κ.τ.λ.

⁴¹⁶ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 5, ἑπτὰ δὲ ἐν ἑκάστη πόλει δικαστὰς [κατέστησεν]. Those courts of seven judges were called upon to deal only with causes of a more trifling kind, but *not* with τὰ μείζω πράγματα καὶ τὰς φονικὰς δίκας, the adjudication of which was rather reserved for the council of seventy which Josephus had established.

⁴¹⁷ *Megilla* xxvi. a: "Rabba said, that regulation (of the Mishna with regard to the sale of synagogues and their furniture) applies only to those cases in which the seven leading men of the town have not disposed of them by public sale. But if they shall have sold them publicly," etc. Comp. also Rhenferd's *Investigatio praefectorum et ministrorum synagogae*, ii. 25 (in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxi.).

⁴¹⁸ Deut. xxi. 5; 1 Chron. xxiii. 4, xxvi. 29. Knobel's note on Deut. xvi. 18.

⁴¹⁹ *Sanhedrin* i. 3. Comp. on the subject generally of priests acting in the capacity of judges, Ezek. xlv. 24, and Smend's note on this passage.

persons, and that one of this sort was assigned to every town with a population of at least 120 or, according to R. Nehemiah's view, of at least 230, in order that there might thus be a judge for every ten of the inhabitants.⁴²⁰ It must be confessed however that here too, as in so many other instances, we have no guarantee that the actual state of things quite corresponded with these regulations. Those courts of twenty-three members were likewise empowered to deal with criminal cases of a serious nature (דִּינֵי נַפְשׁוֹת),⁴²¹ for we can also see from Matt. v. 21, 22, that the trying and sentencing of murderers did not belong exclusively to the jurisdiction of the supreme court of the Sanhedrim.

As in the case of the Hellenistic communes, so too within the Jewish domain the villages were subordinate to the towns, and the smaller towns again to the larger ones. The distinction between a town (עִיר) and a village (קִיָּצֵר, seldom כִּפְּרָה) is presupposed from beginning to end of the Old Testament itself; the former, as a rule, being an inhabited place surrounded by a wall, and the latter one that is not so enclosed (see in particular, Lev. xxv. 29–31); at the same time, towns themselves are also sometimes distinguished as walled and unwalled (Deut. iii. 5; Esth. ix. 19). Moreover, Josephus and the New Testament uniformly distinguish between the two notions πόλις and κώμη.⁴²² On one occasion the New Testament speaks of κωμοπόλεις of Palestine (Mark i. 38), i.e. towns which, as regards their constitution, only enjoyed the rank of a κώμη.⁴²³ In the Mishna there are three conceptions of this matter, and these are uniformly

⁴²⁰ *Sanhedrin* i. 6. Comp. Selden, *De synedriis* ii. 5. Winer's *Realwörterb.* ii. 554. Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. xv. p. 324 f.

⁴²¹ *Sanhedrin* i. 4.

⁴²² Comp. Winer's *Realwörterb.* ii. 510; also the materials to be found in the concordances to the New Testament. For the conception of a κώμη in the Romano-Hellenistic sense, consult Marquardt's *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. i. (2nd ed. 1881) p. 16 f.

⁴²³ The term κωμόπολις is also to be met with occasionally in Strabo and the Byzantine writers; consult the Lexicons and Wetzstein's *Nov. Test.*, note on Mark i. 38.

distinguished from each other: that of a large city (פְּרָדָּה), then that of a city (עִיר), and lastly that of a village (כְּפָר).⁴²⁴ The distinguishing characteristic in the case of the first two would seem to have been merely the difference in size; for even an ordinary town (עִיר) might be enclosed by a wall, and indeed it usually was so.⁴²⁵ In the Old Testament there is already frequent allusion to the subordination of the *villages* to the towns. In the lists of towns given in the Book of Joshua, and above all in the fifteenth and nineteenth chapters, we often meet with the expression, the “cities with their villages” (הָעָרִים וְהַחֲצֵרֵיהֶן). Elsewhere we frequently read of a city and its daughter (בְּנוֹתֶיהָ), Num. xxi. 25, 32, xxxii. 42; Josh. xv. 45–47, xvii. 11; Judg. xi. 26; Neh. xi. 25 ff.; 1 Chron. ii. 23, v. 16, vii. 28 f., viii. 12, xviii. 1; 2 Chron. xiii. 19, xxviii. 18; Ezek. xvi. 46 ff., xxvi. 6, xxx. 18; 1 Macc. v. 8, 65. And in keeping with the idea of the daughter, we also find the term “mother” employed to designate the chief town of a district (2 Sam. xx. 19). From all this it is, in any case, clear that the villages were everywhere dependent upon the cities. But it is also highly probable that this was no less true of the smaller towns in relation to the larger ones. For frequently it is not only to villages, but also to smaller dependent towns that the designation “mother” is applied; at least in several instances is this most undoubtedly the case (Num. xxi. 25; Josh. xv. 45–47; 1 Chron. ii. 23). And what we thus gather from the Old Testament may be assumed to be no less applicable to later times as well (comp. especially, 1 Macc. v. 8: τῇ Ἰαζήρ καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῆς; *ibid.* v. 65: τῇ Χεβρων καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῆς). But it is in the country on the east of the Jordan above all, and in the

⁴²⁴ *Megilla* i. 1, ii. 3; *Kethuboth* xiii. 10; *Kiddushin* ii. 3; *Baba mezia* iv. 6, viii. 6; *Arachin* vi. 5.

⁴²⁵ עִיר חֹמָה, *Arachin* ix. 3 ff.; *Kelim* i. 7. On פֶּיָּה, comp. Lightfoot, *Horae hebr.*, note on Mark i. 38 (*Opp.* ii. 437), and Levy's *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* s.v. This word is, strictly speaking, Aramaic (פְּרָדָּה) and frequently occurs in the Targums in the sense of a fortification, a stronghold, a fortified town. See Buxtorf's *Lex.* and Levy's *Chald. Wörterb.*, s.v.

district of Trachonitis in particular, that *capital villages* (μητροκωμιαί), i.e. villages holding a position corresponding to that of a capital town, were most frequently to be met with.⁴²⁶ Thus Phaena, the modern Mismie, is called *μητροκωμία τοῦ Τράχωνος*.⁴²⁷ We have another example of a *μητροκωμία* in the case of Borechath, the modern Breike, which is also situated within the district of Trachonitis.⁴²⁸ Epiphanius mentions *τὴν Βάκαθον μητροκωμίαν τῆς Ἀραβίας τῆς Φιλαδελφίας*.⁴²⁹ Of course those testimonies only date from somewhere between the second and the fourth centuries of our era; moreover, the population of those districts, though of a mixed character, was composed chiefly of Gentiles.

Any notices of a more special kind that we have regarding the subordination of certain provinces to some of the larger cities apply exclusively to Galilee and Judaea, and only date from the Roman period. In Galilee, *Sepphoris* was the place which Gabinius fixed upon as the seat of one of the five *συνέδρια* or *σύνοδοι*; and as the one which sat here was the only one in the province (*Antt.* xiv. 5. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 8. 5), Sepphoris became, in consequence, the centre of an organization that embraced the whole of Galilee. It is true the arrangement of Gabinius here referred to was of but short duration. But in later times as well, and particularly under the Idumaeen dynasty, the whole of Galilee was always subordinate to some *one* capital city, whether Sepphoris on the one hand or Tiberias on the other (see above, notes 31 and 33). Here then we have an instance of a Jewish province being placed in

⁴²⁶ See in general, Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerl. Verfassung des römischen Reichs*, ii. 380 ff. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. i. 2nd ed. p. 427, note 1. The Lexicons under the word *μητροκωμία*.

⁴²⁷ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* No. 4551 = Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscr.* t. iii. No. 2524. The inscription dates from the time of Alexander Severus (222–235 A.D.). On Phaena, see Raumer's *Pal.* p. 254 f. Porter's *Five Years in Damascus*, ii. 244. Kuhn, ii. 384.

⁴²⁸ Le Bas et Waddington, vol. iii. n. 2396.

⁴²⁹ Epiphanius, *Anacephal.* p. 145

subordination to a capital city that was not of a purely Jewish character.⁴³⁰

In Judaea again it is to the division of the province into eleven or ten toparchies, vouched for both by Josephus and Pliny, that a special interest attaches. According to Josephus, Judaea was divided into the following eleven *κληρουχίαι* or *τοπαρχίαι*:—(1) Jerusalem, (2) *Gophna*, (3) *Akrabatta*, (4) *Thamna*, (5) *Lydda*, (6) *Ammaus*, (7) Pella, (8) Idumaea, (9) Engaddi, (10) *Herodeion*, (11) *Jericho*.⁴³¹ Of these, the seven printed in italics are also mentioned by Pliny, who, by adding to them the following three: *Jopica*, *Bethleptephene*, *Orine*,⁴³² brings up the total number of toparchies to ten. The mention of Orine instead of Jerusalem cannot be said to make any material difference. But the mention of Joppa in this instance is quite as erroneous as that of Pella by Josephus, for both of these were independent towns and did not belong to Judaea proper. Bethleptepha, on the other hand, is mentioned by Josephus in another passage, and that as being the capital of a toparchy.⁴³³ We may therefore obtain a correct list if we adopt that of Josephus and substitute Bethleptepha for Pella.⁴³⁴ In that case the toparchies would be grouped as follows:⁴³⁵ in the centre, Jerusalem; to the north

⁴³⁰ The relation is really one of *subordination*, for Josephus speaks distinctly of an *ἄρχειν* and *ὑπακούειν*; see above, notes 363 and 364.

⁴³¹ *Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 5: μερίζεται δὲ εἰς ἑνδεκα κληρουχίας, ὃν ἄρχει μὲν ὡς βασιλεῖον τὰ Ἱερουσόλυμα, προανίσχουσα τῆς περιόικου πάσης ὥσπερ ἡ κεφαλὴ σώματος, αἱ λοιπαὶ δὲ μετ' αὐτὴν διήρηνται τὰς τοπαρχίας. Γόφνα δευτέρα, καὶ μετ' αὐτὴν Ἀκραβαττά, Θαμνά πρὸς ταύταις καὶ Λύδδα καὶ Ἀμμαοῦς καὶ Πέλλη καὶ Ἰδουμαία καὶ Ἐγγαδδαὶ καὶ Ἡρώδειον καὶ Ἱεριχοῦς.

⁴³² Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v. 14. 70: Reliqua Judaea dividitur in toparchias X quo dicemus ordine: Hiericuntem palmetis consitam, fontibus riguam, Emmaum, Lyddam, Jopicam, Acrebitemam, Gophaniticam, Thamniticam, Bethleptephenen, Orinen, in qua fuere Hierosolyma longe clarissima urbium orientis non Iudaeae modo, Herodium cum oppido inlustri ejusdem nominis.

⁴³³ *Bell. Jud.* iv. 8. 1: τὴν Βεθλεπτηφῶν τοπαρχίαν.

⁴³⁴ Comp. Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerl. Verf.* ii. 339.

⁴³⁵ Comp. Menke's *Bibel-Atlas*, map v.

of it, Gophna⁴³⁶ and Akrabatta;⁴³⁷ to the north-west, Thamna⁴³⁸

⁴³⁶ According to *Tab. Peut.* Gophna stood on the road leading from Jerusalem to Neapolis (Sichem), sixteen miles to the north of the former, or according to Euseb. *Onomast.* fifteen miles (ed. Lagarde, p. 300: Γοφνά . . . ἀπέχουσα Αἰλίας σημείοις ιε' κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν εἰς Νεάπολιν ἄγουσαν). It was a place of some importance in the time of Cassius, who sold its inhabitants as slaves (*Antt.* xiv. 11. 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 11. 2). The Γοφνιτικὴ τοπαρχία is also mentioned by Josephus elsewhere (*Bell. Jud.* i. 1. 5, ii. 20. 4, iv. 9. 9). Comp. besides, *Bell. Jud.* v. 2. 1, vi. 2. 2. In Ptolemaeus v. 16. 7, it occurs in the form of Γούφνα, Hebrew נְבֻנָּא (Neubauer, *Géogr. du Talmud*, p. 157 ff.), the modern form being Dschifna, Jufna. See in general, Raumer's *Pal.* p. 199; Robinson's *Palaest.* ii. 263, 264; Guérin's *Judée*, iii. pp. 28–32. *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, ii. pp. 294, 323, and the accompanying maps, No. xiv.

⁴³⁷ Akrabatta, still farther north than Gophna and nine miles to the south-east of Neapolis=Sichem (Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lag. p. 214: 'Ακραβ-βέιν . . . κώμη δὲ ἔστιν μόγις διεστῶσα Νέας πόλεως σημείοις θ'). According to Mishna, *Maaser sheni* v. 2, חֲרָרָה was a day's journey to the north of Jerusalem, precisely the same distance as Lydda was to the west of it, which is as near the mark as can be. The 'Ακραβαττινὴ τοπαρχία is also of frequent occurrence elsewhere in Josephus and Eusebius (*Joseph. Bell. Jud.* ii. 12. 4, 20. 4, 22. 2, iii. 3. 4, iv. 9. 3–4 and 9. Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lag. pp. 214, 255, 267, 294, 295). The place is known at the present day as Akrabeh. See in general, Raumer's *Pal.* p. 170. Robinson's *Palestine*, iii. pp. 296, 297. Guérin's *Samarie*, ii. 3–5. *The Survey, etc., Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, ii. pp. 386, 389 f.; and the accompanying map, No. xv. Beware of confounding this with a range of hills of the same name in the south of Judaea, Num. xxxiv. 4; Josh. xv. 3; Judg. i. 36; Euseb. *Onomast.* p. 214; and from which the 'Ακραβαττινὴ mentioned in the first Book of the Maccabees (1 Macc. v. 3=Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 8. 1) derives its name.

⁴³⁸ Thamna is undoubtedly the ancient תְּמַנָּה-הַר or תְּמַנָּה-הַר in Mount Ephraim where Joshua was buried (Josh. xix. 50, xxiv. 30; Judg. ii. 9). Eusebius frequently mentions the place as being a very large village within the district of Diospolis=Lydda (see especially, p. 260, ed. Lag.: Θαμνά . . . διαμένει κώμη μεγάλη ἐν ὁρίοις Διοσπόλεως), and remarks that, in his day, people were shown Joshua's tomb at a spot near by (p. 246: δέικνυται δὲ ἐπίσημον εἰς ἔτι νῦν αὐτοῦ τὸ μνήμα πλησίον Θαμνά κώμης. *Ibid.* p. 261: Θαμναθσαρά . . . αὕτη ἐστὶ Θαμνά . . . ἐν ἣ εἰς ἔτι νῦν δέικνυται τὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μνήμα). The place still exists, though only as a heap of ruins, and is known by the name of Tibneh, standing in a tolerably straight line between Akrabeh and Lydda, as was to be expected from the order of the toparchies as given by Josephus. Among the important tombs still to be seen at this place Guérin believes that he has actually discovered that of Joshua. See in general, Raumer's *Pal.* p. 165 f. De Saulcy's *Voyage en Terre Sainte* (1865), ii. 233 f. Guérin's *Samarie*, ii. pp. 89–104. *The Survey of Western Palestine*,

and Lydda;⁴³⁹ to the west, Emmaus;⁴⁴⁰ to the south-west, Bethleptepha;⁴⁴¹ to the south, Idumaea;⁴⁴² to the south-

Memoirs, etc., ii. 299 f., 274–378, with the accompanying map, No. xiv. Mühlau in Riehm's *Wörterb.* p. 1668. In the time of Cassius, Thamna shared the same fate as Gophna (*Antt.* xiv. 11. 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 11. 2). The toparchy of Thamna is also mentioned elsewhere by Josephus and Eusebius (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 4, iv. 8. 1. Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lagarde, pp. 219, 239). Comp. also Ptolem. v. 16. 8. We must take care to distinguish between our Thamna and another תַּמְנָה or תַּמְנָתָה situated on the border between the tribe of Dan and Judah to the west of Jerusalem and in the direction of Ashdod. This one is also existing in the present day, and is likewise known under the name of Tibneh (Josh. xv. 10, xix. 43; Judg. xiv. 1 ff.; 2 Chron. xxviii. 18). And lastly, from this we must further distinguish a third one situated in the hill country of Judah (Gen. xxxviii. 12–14; Josh. xv. 57). Which *Θαμναβά* is meant in 1 Macc. ix. 50 it is impossible to determine with any certainty. See in general, Raumer, p. 224. Robinson's *Pal.* ii. pp. 239, 240. Guérin's *Judée*, ii. 30 f. *The Survey*, etc., *Memoirs*, ii. 417, maps, No. xvi.

⁴³⁹ Lydda (Hebr. לָדָד, afterwards Diospolis), the well-known town on the road from Joppa to Jerusalem, is also mentioned (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 4) as one of the toparchies of Judaea. On one occasion Josephus characterizes it as *κώμη . . . πόλεως τὸ μέγεθος οὐκ ἀποδέουσα* (*Antt.* xx. 6. 2). For its history, comp. especially 1 Macc. xi. 34; Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 10. 6, 11. 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 11. 2, ii. 19. 1, iv. 8. 1.

⁴⁴⁰ Emmaus or Ammaus, the Nicopolis of later times, is still existing under the name of Amwās, and is situated to the south by south-east of Lydda. Owing to the circumstance of its standing just at the foot of the mountain range it was a place of some military importance, and is frequently mentioned as such as early as the time of the Maccabees (1 Macc. iii. 40, 57, iv. 3, ix. 50). For its later history, see especially *Antt.* xiv. 11. 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 11. 2; *Antt.* xvii. 10. 9; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 5. 1, iv. 8. 1. It is also mentioned as one of the Jewish toparchies in *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 4. In Rabbinical Hebrew it is called מִשְׁנָא (Mishna, *Arachin* ii. 4; *Kerithoth* iii. 7. Lightfoot, *Chorographica Lucae praemissa*, c. 4, *Opp.* ii. 479 f. Neubauer's *Géogr. du Talmud*, pp. 100–102); it also occurs in Ptolemaeus, v. 16. 7, as Ἐμμαοῦς. Whether it is the same Emmaus that is intended in *Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 6 and Luke xxiv. 13, is open to question. Comp. in general, Reland's *Palaestina*, pp. 758–760. Raumer, p. 187 f. Winer's *Realwörterb.* under this word. Arnold in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. iii. 778 f. Robinson's *Palestine*, iii. pp. 146–151. Kuhn, *Die städtische u. bürgerl. Verfassung*, ii. 356 f. Sepp's *Jerusalem*, 2nd ed. i. 40 ff. Guérin's *Judée*, i. 293–308. *The Survey of Western Palestine*, *Memoirs*, etc., iii. 14, 36 ff., 63–81, and the maps, No. xvii.

⁴⁴¹ According to *Bell. Jud.* iv. 8. 1, Bethleptepha stood between Emmaus and Idumaea, and should therefore be inserted here instead of Pella, as erroneously given in the text of Josephus.

⁴⁴² Idumaea had been Judaized by John Hyrcanus (*Antt.* xiii. 9. 1, xv

east, Engaddi ⁴⁴³ and Herodeion; ⁴⁴⁴ to the east, Jericho. ⁴⁴⁵ It may be assumed as self-evident that this division was made chiefly for administrative reasons and, above all, with a view to greater convenience in the *collecting of the revenue*. Whether those districts were at the same time districts for judicial purposes as well, it is impossible to say. In any case it is probable that the whole organization does not date farther back than the Roman period, for no trace of it is to be met with previous to that time. ⁴⁴⁶ The authorities from whom our information is derived exhibit a singular indecision in their conceptions of the political character of the capitals of those districts, inasmuch as at one time they are described as *πόλεις*, at another as *κῶμαι*. It is true that here nothing is to be made of the circumstance that Eusebius treats the

7, 9. *Bell. Jud.* i. 2. 6). Hence it was that the Idumaeans took part in the Jewish insurrection as though they too had been Jews (*Bell. Jud.* iv. 4. 4). Elsewhere, comp. especially *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 4, iv. 8. 1.

⁴⁴³ Engaddi, the ancient *יְגֵדִי* (Josh. xv. 62; 1 Sam. xxiv. 1 ff.; Ezek. xlvii. 10; Song of Sol. i. 14; 2 Chron. xx. 2), the existence of which on the western shore of the Dead Sea is vouched for by both Josephus and Eusebius (Joseph. *Antt.* ix. 1. 2: 'Εγγαδδὶ πόλιν κειμένην πρὸς τῇ Ἀσφαλιτίδι λίμνῃ. Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Lagarde, p. 254: καὶ νῦν ἐστὶ κώμη μεγίστη Ἰουδαίων Ἐγγαδδὶ παρακειμένη τῇ νεκρᾷ θαλάσῃ). In *Bell. Jud.* iv. 7. 2, Josephus calls it a *πολίχνη*. In Ptolemaeus, v. 16. 8, it occurs as Ἐγγάδδα. It is known in the present day as Ain Dschidi. See in general, Winer's *Realwörterb.* under the word. Raumer, 188 f. Robinson's *Palestine*, i. pp. 500–508. Neubauer's *Géogr. du Talmud*, p. 160. *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs*, etc., iii. pp. 384–386, 387, and the accompanying maps, No. xxii.

⁴⁴⁴ Herodeion is the important fortress built by Herod the Great in the south of Judaea, some sixty stadia from Jerusalem (*Antt.* xiv. 13. 9, xv. 9. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 13. 8, 21. 10), the identity of which, with the modern "Frankenberge" standing to the south-east of Bethlehem, may now be looked upon as generally admitted. Comp. above, § 15.

⁴⁴⁵ Jericho, the well-known city of that name near to the Jordan, was the most important town in the east of Judaea, and for this reason it too was chosen by Gabinius as the seat of one of the five Jewish courts or Sanhedrims (*Antt.* xiv. 5. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 8. 5). It is also mentioned as being one of the districts of Judaea in *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 4. Besides this, comp. especially *Bell. Jud.* iv. 8. 2, 9. 1.

⁴⁴⁶ On the division of the Roman provinces into administrative districts, see in general Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. i. (2nd ed. 1881) p. 500 f.

places in question for the most part as *κῶμαι*, for by his time matters had undergone an essential change.⁴⁴⁷ But Josephus himself is also somewhat undecided. For example, he speaks of Emmaus as being the *μητρόπολις* of the district in which it stood, and obviously therefore as that of the toparchy;⁴⁴⁸ whereas, in speaking of Lydda, on the other hand, he calls it merely a *κῶμη*, thus employing what would appear to be the more correct designation (see above, note 439). We are therefore bound to assume, that from the Romano-Hellenistic point of view none of the places in question were *πόλεις* in the strict sense of the word, that is to say, they were not civic communities with a Hellenistic constitution; while it was only in deference to Jewish and popular usage that they were spoken of as "*cities*." Strictly speaking, they ought rather to be called *κωμοπόλεις* (see above, note 423), or, viewed in their relation to their respective toparchies, *μητροκωμιαί* (see above, notes 427–429).

There was only *one* town in Judaea proper that, according to Romano-Hellenistic ideas, enjoyed at the same time the rank of a *πόλις*, and that was *Jerusalem*. To this latter all the rest of Judaea was subordinate, so that it ruled over it (Judaea) *ὡς βασιλείον* (see note 431). Consequently its relation to Judaea was similar to that in which the Hellenistic cities stood to their respective districts.⁴⁴⁹ This among other things is implied in the style of address that is made use of in the imperial edicts issued to the Jews and which run thus: *Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ, Ἰουδαίων παντὶ ἔθνει*, terms precisely similar to those employed in the edicts

⁴⁴⁷ The names of several toparchies (*Ἀκραβαττηνὴ, Θαμνιτικὴ*) were no doubt still retained in Eusebius' day, but the constitution itself had been essentially altered by the establishment of new, independent *civitates* such as Diospolis, Nicopolis and others. The result of this was that Thamna, for example, ceased to be any longer the capital of a toparchy, but was now reduced to the position of a *κῶμη μεγάλη ἐν ὁρίοις Διοσπόλεως* (see above, note 438), and so became subordinate to what was formerly known as Lydda.

⁴⁴⁸ *Bell. Jud.* iv. 8. 1.

⁴⁴⁹ Comp. Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerl. Verfassung*, ii. 342–345.

addressed to the Hellenistic communes where, in like manner, the city with its council ruled over, and therefore was regarded as representing the whole district to which it belonged.⁴⁵⁰ It is further probable that the council (the Sanhedrim) of Jerusalem was also responsible for the collection of the taxes throughout the whole of Judaea.⁴⁵¹ Again there is a reminiscence of the circumstance of the "elders" exercising authority over the whole of Judaea still preserved to us in the Mishna.⁴⁵² But since the death of Herod the Great at least, the civil jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim of Jerusalem was entirely restricted to *Judaea proper*. Ever since then, Galilee and Peraea were, as regards their political relations, entirely severed from Judaea, or at all events formed independent spheres of administration, as has been pointed out above with special reference to Galilee. And least of all

⁴⁵⁰ *Antt.* xx. 1. 2. Comp. besides for similar styles of address as employed in edicts, *Antt.* xiv. 10 (Σιδωνίων ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δῆμα, Ἐφεσίων βουλῇ καὶ ἄρχουσι καὶ δῆμα, and such like).

⁴⁵¹ When, after the first throes of the insurrection, it was resolved to return, for a moment, to a peaceful attitude, the magistrates and members of the council of Jerusalem distributed themselves over the villages for the purpose of collecting the arrears of the tribute (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 1: εἰς δὲ τὰς κώμας οἱ τε ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ βουλευταὶ μερισθέντες τοὺς φόρους συνέλεγον). The sums from the different quarters were speedily gathered together and were found to amount in all to forty talents. But, immediately thereafter, Agrippa sent the ἄρχοντες and δυνατοί to Caesarea to Florus with the request that he would appoint from among them tribute collectors for the country (*ibid.* ἵνα ἐκεῖνος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποδείξῃ τοὺς τὴν χώραν φορολογήσοντας). Now, seeing that this took place *after* the taxes of the district, and therefore, of course, of the toparchy of Jerusalem, had been already collected, it follows that, by the term *χώρα*, the whole of Judaea is to be understood. It was therefore for the whole of this province that the collectors were to be appointed from among the ἄρχοντες and δυνατοί of Jerusalem. For the Roman practice of employing city councils as a medium for collecting the taxes, comp. in general, Marquardt, i. 501.

⁴⁵² *Taanith* iii. 6: "On one occasion the elders went from Jerusalem to visit their towns (ירדו זקנים מירושלים לעריהם) and appointed fasts, because they found in Ascalon (באשקלון) a patch of blighted corn about the size of the mouth of an oven, etc." As Ascalon never belonged to the province of Judaea, this notice is in itself unhistorical, though it is correct in so far as it contains a reminiscence of the fact, that at one time the towns of Judaea were subject to the authority of the "elders" of Jerusalem.

can we venture to make use of the circumstance that the rebellion in Galilee was directed from Jerusalem as an argument to show, that in times of peace as well, Galilee was under the jurisdiction of the supreme court of the Sanhedrim. For the circumstances here in question are obviously of an exceptional character. It was only in earlier days, and particularly during the Asmonaeon period, that the whole land of Judaea could be said to have been really one in a political sense as well (comp. below, chap. iii.). As the council of Jerusalem could scarcely have been able to attend to the administration of justice in all its details, it is antecedently probable that, besides the supreme Sanhedrim, there would be one or more inferior tribunals in Jerusalem. Of this too the Mishna has preserved a reminiscence, though it happens to be a somewhat confused one.⁴⁵⁸

III. THE SUPREME SANHEDRIM IN JERUSALEM.

THE LITERATURE.

Selden, *De synedriis et praefecturis juridicis veterum Ebraeorum*, lib. i.-iii., Londini 1650-1655 (comp. above, p. 132).

Meuschen, *Novum Testamentum ex Talmude et antiquitatibus Hebraeorum illustratum* (Lips. 1736), pp. 1184-1199: *Diatrise de נשיא seu direttore Synedrii M. Hebraeorum*.

⁴⁵⁸ *Sanhedrin* xi. 2: "There were three courts of justice (בתי דינין) in Jerusalem. One held its sittings at the entrance to the temple mount (על פתח), another at the entrance to the court of the temple (הר הבית), and the third in the square chamber (בלשכת הנוית). The parties came with their causes to the one that sat at the entrance to the temple mount, and the presiding judge said: 'Thus have I and thus have my colleagues pronounced; thus have I and thus have my colleagues resolved.' If then the court had a tradition applicable to the case in question it gave a decision. But if not, the parties went to the tribunal at the entrance to the court of the temple and there restated their case. If this one again had a tradition bearing upon the case, it gave a decision. But if not, then the parties along with the members of those courts appeared before the supreme court in the square chamber, the fountainhead of law for the whole of Israel." The schematism with reference to the places at which the courts were held, is of itself sufficient to show that we are not here dealing with an authentic historical tradition.

- Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus antiquitatum sacri codicis* (1748), pp 550–600.
- Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen* (1831), pp. 166–225.
- Winer, *Realwörterb.* ii. 551–554, art. “Synedrium.”
- Sachs, *Ueber die Zeit der Entstehung des Synhedrin's* (Frankel's *Zeitschr. für die religiösen Interessen des Judenth.*, 1845, pp. 301–312).
- Saalschütz, *Das mosaische Rechte*, 2nd ed. 1853, i. 49 ff., ii. 593 ff. Also his *Archäologie der Hebräer*, vol. ii. 1856, pp. 249 ff., 271 ff., 429–458.
- Levy, *Die Präsidatur im Synedrium* (Frankel's *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1855, pp. 266–274, 301–307, 339–358).
- Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. ii. (1855) pp. 380–396.
- Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, vol. i. (1857) pp. 120–128, 270–281. Comp. also pp. 403 ff., vol. ii. (1858) pp. 13 ff., 25 ff.
- Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel* (1857), p. 114 ff.
- Keil, *Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie* (2nd ed. 1875), pp. 714–717.
- Leyrer, art. “Synedrium,” in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. xv. (1862) pp. 315–325.
- Langen, *Das jüdische Synedrium und die römische Procuratur in Judäa* (Tüb. *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1862, pp. 411–463).
- Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. iii. (3rd ed. 1878) pp. 110 ff., 683–685.
- De Wette, *Lehrbuch der hebräisch-jüdischen Archäologie* (4th ed. 1864), pp. 204–206.
- Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (3rd ed. 1864–1868), iv. 217 ff., v. 56, vi. 697 ff.
- Kuenen, *Over de samenstelling van het Sanhedrin* (Verslagen en Mededeelingen der koninkl. Academie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde, Deel x., Amsterdam 1866, pp. 131–168). Comp. also, *De Godsdienst van Israël*, ii. (1870) pp. 512–515.
- Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine* (1867), pp. 83–94, 465–468.
- Ginsburg, art. “Sanhedrim,” in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*.
- Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, vol. i. (2nd ed. 1873) pp. 63–72.
- Wieseler, *Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien* (1869), pp. 205–230.
- Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. pp. 321 ff., 345 ff.
- Wellhausen, *Die Phariseer und die Sadducäer* (1874), pp. 26–43.
- Holtzmann, art. “Synedrium,” in Schenkel's *Bibelleicon*, v. 446–451.
- Hoffmann (D.), *Der oberste Gerichtshof in der Stadt des Heilighthums* (*Progr. des Rabbiner-Seminares zu Berlin für 1877–1878*). Also his *Die Präsidatur im Synedrium* (*Magazin für die Wissensch. des Judenth.* v. Jahrg. 1878, pp. 94–99).
- Reuss, *Geschichte der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), secs. cccclxxvi., cccclxxv.
- Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, part 2, 1883, art. “Synhedrion;” also the articles “Nassi” and “Abbethdin.”
- Stapfer, *Le Sanhédrin de Jérusalem au premier siècle* (*Revue de théologie et de philosophie* [Lausanne], 1884, pp. 105–119).

1. *Its history.* There is no evidence to show that, *previous to the Greek period*, there existed at Jerusalem an aristocratic council claiming to exercise either supreme, or what was substantially supreme, authority and jurisdiction over the whole Jewish nation. It is true no doubt that Rabbinical exegesis has sought to identify the Sanhedrim of later times with the council of seventy elders that, at his own request, had once been granted to Moses to assist him with its advice (Num. xi. 16), and has, in consequence, assumed that this same council continued without interruption from the days of Moses down to Talmudic times. But during the first thousand years of this period we find practically no trace whatever of its existence. For the "elders" that are sometimes mentioned as being the representatives of the people (for example in 1 Kings viii. 1, xx. 7; 2 Kings xxiii. 1; Ezek. xiv. 1, xx. 1) did not constitute a regularly organized court like the future Sanhedrim. Then again, the supreme court at Jerusalem, the existence of which is presupposed in the Deuteronomic legislation (Deut. xvii. 8 ff., xix. 16 ff.), and the institution of which the author of Chronicles ascribes to Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xix. 8), was merely a court of justice with functions of an exclusively judicial character, and not a council *governing*, or at all events substantially governing, the country as was the Sanhedrim of the Graeco-Roman age.^{453a} But further, it is, to say the least of it, uncertain whether any such court as that of the Sanhedrim existed even in the Persian era. No doubt, at that time, the *municipal* Council of Jerusalem formed the centre of the small Jewish commonwealth very much as it did at a subsequent period. And thus far we might be justified in understanding the "elders" of the Book of Ezra (Ezra v. 5, 9, vi. 7, 14, x. 8), and the חֹרִים and סִנְיִים of the Book of Nehemiah (Neh. ii. 16, iv. 8, 13, v. 7, vii. 5), as corresponding somewhat to the future Sanhe-

^{453a} Such certainly is the way Josephus conceives of the matter when, following the analogy of a later order of things, he speaks of the court of justice here referred to under the designation of ἡ γερουσία (*Antt.* iv. 8. 41).

drim. But judging from the whole way in which they are mentioned, it is more probable that the various orders referred to are regarded in their individual capacity and not as constituting an organized body. In any case the existence of a Jewish *γερουσία* earlier than the Greek period cannot be proved with any degree of certainty. The first occasion on which it is mentioned, and that under this designation, is in the time of Antiochus the Great (223–187 B.C.), so that it must, of course, have been in existence as early as the time of the Ptolemies.⁴⁵⁴ Now seeing that, in its desire for reform everywhere and in everything, Hellenism had set itself to reorganize political institutions as well, we are bound to assume that, in all probability, it was just the new Greek rulers who would give to the Jewish *γερουσία* the form in which it was met with at the period now in question, whether that form were entirely an original one or whether it were simply a reorganization of a similar court that was already in existence under the Persian rule. From the circumstance of the designation *γερουσία* being applied to it, it is clear that, unlike the majority of Greek councils, this was not a democratic, but an *aristocratic* body.⁴⁵⁵ This same circumstance would seem further to show that, so far as its original institution is concerned, this court dates back to an earlier period, and therefore to the time of the Persian rule. As we may well conceive, its powers would be of a tolerably large and extensive character. For the Hellenistic kings had conceded a great amount of internal freedom to municipal communities, and were on the whole satisfied if the taxes were duly paid and their own supremacy duly recognised. At the head of the Jewish commonwealth, and therefore of the *γερουσία* as well, stood the *hereditary high priest*. It was

⁴⁵⁴ *Antt.* xii. 3. 3. For this whole matter, comp. Kuenen's admirable dissertation in the *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der koninkl. Akademie van Wetenschappen*, *l.c.*

⁴⁵⁵ A *γερουσία* is always an *aristocratic* body. The Council of Sparta is expressly described as such, and so too with regard to councils generally in the Doric States. See Westermann in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iii. 849 f.

this latter, in conjunction with the *γερουσία* over which he presided, that practically regulated the whole internal affairs of the nation.

After the Maccabaeen insurrection the old high-priestly dynasty was superseded, its place being now supplied by the new *Asmonaeen* line of high priests, which began with Simon, and which was likewise a hereditary one. Then again the old *γερουσια* must have been essentially revolutionized through its being purged of every element in it suspected of Greek sympathies and leanings. But the court itself still continued to exist and exercise its functions along with and under the *Asmonaeen* princes and high priests; for even these latter could not venture to go so far as entirely to discard the old nobility of Jerusalem. Hence we find the *γερουσία* mentioned in the time of Judas (2 Macc. i. 10, iv. 44, xi. 27; the *πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ* of 1 Macc. vii. 33 being also identically the same thing), of Jonathan (1 Macc. xii. 6: *ἡ γερουσία τοῦ ἔθνους*; *ibid.* xi. 23: *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι Ἰσραὴλ*; *ibid.* xii. 35: *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ*) and of Simon (1 Macc. xiii. 36, xiv. 20, 28).⁴⁵⁶ Its existence is likewise presupposed in the Book of Judith, which probably belongs to the period now in question (Judith iv. 8, xi. 14, xv. 8). The assumption of the title of king on the part of the *Asmonaeen* princes, and above all the autocratic rule of an Alexander Jannaeus, indicated no doubt an advance in the direction of a pure monarchy. But, for all that, the old *γερουσία* still continued to assert itself as much as ever. At least in the reign of

⁴⁵⁶ It is interesting in this connection to compare 1 Macc. xii. 6 with 1 Macc. xiv. 20. The matter in hand is the correspondence between the Jews and the Spartans. In the former of those passages (1 Macc. xii. 6 = Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 5. 8) the Jews as the senders of the communication style themselves thus: *Ἰωνάθαν ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ ἡ γερουσία τοῦ ἔθνους καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ ὁ λοιπὸς δῆμος τῶν Ἰουδαίων*. In the reply of the Spartans the terms of the address (1 Macc. xiv. 20) are as follows: *Σιμωνι ἱερεῖ μεγάλῳ καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι καὶ τῷ λοιπῷ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*. Observe (1) that *ἡ γερουσία* and *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι* are identically the same; (2) that in both instances the classification is of a *fourfold character* High priest, *gerousia*, priests, people.

Alexandra we find τῶν Ἰουδαίων οἱ πρεσβύτεροι expressly mentioned (*Antt.* xiii. 16. 5).⁴⁵⁷

It is true that, when a new order of things was introduced by Pompey, the monarchy was abolished. But the high priest still retained the *προστασία τοῦ ἔθνους* (*Antt.* xx. 10), and therefore it may be presumed that meanwhile the position of the *γερονσία* would remain essentially the same as before.⁴⁵⁸ The existing arrangements however were rather more seriously disturbed by Gabinius (57–55 B.C.), when he divided the whole of the Jewish territory into five *σύνοδοι* (*Bell. Jud.* i. 8. 5) or *συνέδρια* (*Antt.* xiv. 5. 4).⁴⁵⁹ Now, seeing that of those five synedria *three* were allotted to Judaea proper (*viz.* those of Jerusalem, Gazara and Jericho) it follows that the jurisdiction of the council of Jerusalem, if it really retained anything of its previous character at all, would extend only to something like a third part of the province. But probably that measure meant rather more than a mere limiting of jurisdiction. For the five *συνέδρια* established by Gabinius were not municipal councils, but—as indeed we might have supposed from the fact that Josephus uses the term *σύνοδοι* as a synonymous expression—genuine Roman *conventus iudici*, “districts for judicial purposes,” into which the Romans were in the habit of dividing every province.⁴⁶⁰ And, that

⁴⁵⁷ Similarly in Tyre and Sidon, for example, there was a council associated with the king in the direction of affairs. See Movers, *Die Phönizier*, ii. 1 (1849), pp. 529–542. Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerl. Verfassung*, ii. 117.

⁴⁵⁸ In the Psalms of Solomon, which for the most part were composed in the time of Pompey, the author is in the habit of apostrophizing as follows any public person or party that he happens to dislike: *ἰνατί σὺ κάθησαι βέβηλε ἐν συνεδρίῳ* (Ps. iv. 1). Now, as it is clear from the context that by the term *συνέδριον* we are to understand a court, it is quite possible that it is our *γερονσία* that is here referred to. But, owing to the ambiguous nature of the expression itself and the impossibility of fixing with *greater precision* the date of the composition of the psalm, there is historically but little to be gleaned from this passage. Any light that is to be thrown upon it must be derived from what we already know regarding the existing order of things.

⁴⁵⁹ On this comp. above, § 13.

⁴⁶⁰ Comp. Marquardt's *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. (1881), p. 501.

being the case, the measure in question must have been neither more nor less than a stricter application to Judaea of the Roman system of provincial government. As things now stood the council of Jerusalem no longer exercised sole jurisdiction within the circuit to which it belonged, but only in conjunction with the other communities within this same district. The arrangements of Gabinius however continued to subsist only somewhere about ten years. For they were in turn superseded by the new system of things introduced by Caesar (47 B.C.). This latter reappointed Hyrcanus II. to his former office of *ἐθνάρχης* of the Jews (see above, § 13); while it is distinctly evident from a circumstance that occurred about that time, that the jurisdiction of the council of Jerusalem once more extended to Galilee as well. The circumstance in question was the occasion on which Herod when a youth was required to appear before the *συνέδριον* at Jerusalem to answer for his doings in Galilee (*Antt.* xiv. 9. 3–5). Here for the first time, as frequently afterwards, the council of Jerusalem was designated by the term *συνέδριον*. As it is unusual elsewhere to find this expression applied to civic councils, such a use, in this instance, is somewhat strange, but probably it is to be explained by the fact that the council of Jerusalem was conceived of as being above all a court of justice (בֵּית דִּין). For it is in this sense that *συνέδριον* is specially used in later Greek.⁴⁶¹

Kuhn (*Die städt. u. bürgerl. Verf.* ii. 336, 367) also regards the Synedria of Gabinius as identical with the *conventus iudicis* of the Romans.

⁴⁶¹ Hesychius, *Lex.* (see word), defines *συνέδριον* precisely by the term *δικαστήριον* (a court of justice). In the Sept. version of Prov. xxii. 10 *συνέδριον* is given as the rendering of דִּין. Comp. also Psalms of Solomon iv. 1. In the New Testament again *συνέδρια* mean simply “courts of justice” (Matt. x. 17; Mark xiii. 9); similarly in the Mishna (see, in particular, *Sanhedrin* i. 5, סנהדריות לשבטים = courts for the tribes, and i. 6, סנהדרין קטנה = an inferior court of justice). Hence Steph. in his *Thes.* (see word) correctly observes: praecipue ita vocatur consessus iudicum. It is true that, in itself, *συνέδριον* is a very comprehensive term and may be applied to every “assembly” and every corporate body, even to the Roman senate, for example (see in general, Stephanus, *Thes.*, under word, and Westermann in Pauly’s *Enc.* vi. 2. 1535). It is but comparatively

Herod the Great inaugurated his reign by ordering the whole of the members of the Sanhedrim to be put to death (*Antt.* xiv. 9. 4: πάντας ἀπέκτεινε τοὺς ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ). Whether the πάντας here is to be understood quite literally may be left an open question. For, according to another passage, Herod is represented as having ordered the forty-five most prominent personages belonging to the party of Antigonus to be put to death (*Antt.* xv. 1. 2: ἀπέκτεινε δὲ τεσσαράκοντα πέντε τοὺς πρώτους ἐκ τῆς αἱρέσεως Ἀντιγόνου). In any case the object of this proceeding was either to get rid entirely of the old nobility, who had been somewhat hostile to his claims, or at all events so to intimidate them as to ensure their acquiescence in the rule of the new sovereign. It was of those then that were disposed to be tractable—among whom also were a good many Pharisees, who saw in Herod's despotic sway a well-merited

seldom however that it is used to denote civic councils, which as every one knows are mostly designated by the terms βουλὴ and γερουσία. It is more frequently employed to denote representative assemblies, composed of deputies from various constituencies. And so we have, for example, the συνέδριον of the Phoenicians which was usually convened in Tripolis (*Diodor.* xvi. 41), the κοινὸν συνέδριον of ancient Lycia, which was composed of representatives from twenty-three different towns (*Strabo*, xiv. 3. 3, p. 664 f.), and the συνέδριον κοινόν of the province of Asia (*Aristides, Orat.* xxvi., ed. *Dindorf*, vol. i. p. 531). Hence it is too that σύμβροτοι and βουλευταί are mentioned separately as constituting two different orders of officials (see inscription at Balbura in Pisidia as given in *Le Bas et Waddington's Inscr.* vol. iii. n. 1221). Moreover, the *senatores* of the four Macedonian districts, who, according to *Livy*, were called σύμβροτοι (*Liv.* xlv. 32: pronuntiatum, quod ad statum Macedoniae pertinebat, senatores, quos synedros vocant, legendos esse, quorum consilio respublica administraretur), were not municipal councillors, but deputies representing an entire *regio* (see *Marquardt's Staatsverwaltung*, i. [1881] p. 317). Now as the term in question was first heard of in Judaea in the time of *Gabinus*, and was thereafter currently applied to the council of Jerusalem as well, one might be inclined to suppose that it had been introduced in this quarter in connection with the *Gabinian* measures of reform, and that its use was still retained even after a new order of things had been established (as I have myself held, *Riehm's Wörterb.* p. 1596). But in presence of the fact, that elsewhere too, even in Hebrew itself, the term is generally used in the sense of a "court of justice," this explanation, I fear, must be abandoned as more ingenious than otherwise.

judgment of heaven—that the new Sanhedrim was now composed. For there is express evidence that such an institution existed in the time of Herod also, inasmuch as one can hardly understand that the “assembly” (*συνέδριον*) before which this monarch successfully prosecuted his charge against the aged Hyrcanus could be taken as referring to any other court than our Sanhedrim (*Antt.* xv. 6. 2, *fin.*).⁴⁶²

After Herod's death Archelaus obtained only a portion of his father's kingdom, viz. the provinces of Judaea and Samaria. Nor can there be any doubt that, in consequence of this, the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim was at the same time restricted to Judaea proper (comp. above, p. 142). This continued to be the state of matters in the time of the *procurators* as well. But, under their administration, the internal government of the country was to a greater extent in the hands of the Sanhedrim than it had been during the reign of Herod and Archelaus. Josephus distinctly intimates as much when he informs us that, ever since the death of Herod and Archelaus, the form of government was that of an aristocracy under the supreme direction of the high priests.⁴⁶³ And accordingly he regards the aristocratic council of Jerusalem as being now the true governing body in contradistinction to the previous monarchical rule of the Idumaeen princes. So too in the time of Christ and the apostles the *συνέδριον* at Jerusalem is frequently mentioned as being the supreme Jewish court, above all, as being the supreme Jewish court of justice (Matt. v. 22, xxvi. 59; Mark xiv. 55, xv. 1; Luke xxii. 66; John xi. 47; Acts iv. 15, v. 21 ff., vi. 12 ff., xxii. 30, xxiii. 1 ff., xxiv. 20). Sometimes again the terms

⁴⁶² Comp. besides, Wieseler's *Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien*, p. 215 f.

⁴⁶³ *Antt.* xx. 10, *fin.*: μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων τελευτὴν ἀριστοκρατία μὲν ἦν ἡ πολιτεία, τὴν δὲ προστασίαν τοῦ ἔθνους οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐπετίστευον. Now, as throughout the whole section it is high priests strictly so called that are in view (and of whom only *one* was in office at a time), it follows that the word ἀρχιερεῖς is to be taken as the categorical plural, so that the meaning would be: the *προστασία* τοῦ ἔθνους was in the hands of the high priest for the time being.

πρεσβυτέριον (Luke xxii. 66 ; Acts xxii. 5) and γερουσία (Acts v. 21) are substituted for συνέδριον.⁴⁶⁴ A member of this court, viz. Joseph of Arimathea, is described in Mark xv. 43, Luke xxiii. 50, as a βουλευτής. Josephus calls the supreme court of Jerusalem a συνέδριον⁴⁶⁵ or a βουλή,⁴⁶⁶ or he comprehends the court and people under the common designation of τὸ κοινόν.⁴⁶⁷ While in the Mishna again the supreme court of justice is called בֵּית דִּין הַגָּדוֹל⁴⁶⁸ or סְנֵה־דִּרְיָן,⁴⁶⁹ likewise שְׁבָעִים יָחָד סְנֵה־דִּרְיָן⁴⁷⁰ or merely סְנֵה־דִּרְיָן.^{470a} There can be no question that, after the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70 A.D., the Sanhedrim was abolished, so far at least as its existing form was concerned. The comparatively large amount of self-government that had hitherto been granted to the Jewish people could no longer be conceded to them after

⁴⁶⁴ A singular feature about the last-mentioned passage (Acts v. 21) is the use of such a form of designation as: τὸ συνέδριον καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γερουσίαν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ. Now, seeing that there can be no question as to the identity of the two conceptions συνέδριον and γερουσία, only one or other of two things is possible, either the καὶ is to be taken as explanatory, or we must assume that the author of the Acts erroneously supposed that the συνέδριον was of a less comprehensive character than the γερουσία ("the Sanhedrim and all the elders of the people together"). The latter is the more natural alternative.

⁴⁶⁵ Thus, in addition to the passages already mentioned (*Antt.* xiv. 9. 3-5, xv. 6. 2, *fin.*), we might refer further to *Antt.* xx. 9. 1 ; *Vita*, 12, the terms of the latter passage being: τὸ συνέδριον τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν. It may be questioned whether it is also the supreme Sanhedrim that is intended in *Antt.* xx. 9. 6 ; comp. Wieseler's *Beiträge*, p. 217.

⁴⁶⁶ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 15. 6 : τοὺς τε ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ τὴν βουλήν. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 16. 2 : Ἰουδαίων οἱ τε ἀρχιερεῖς ἀμα τοῖς δυνατοῖς καὶ ἡ βουλή ; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 1. οἱ τε ἀρχοντες καὶ οἱ βουλευταί. *Comp. Antt.* xx. 1. 2 ; *Bell. Jud.* v. 13. 1. The place of meeting is called βουλή in *Bell. Jud.* v. 4. 2, and βουλευτήριον in *Bell. Jud.* vi. 6. 3.

⁴⁶⁷ *Vita*, 12, 13, 38, 49, 52, 60, 65, 70.

⁴⁶⁸ *Sota* i. 4, ix. 1 ; *Gittin* vi. 7 ; *Sanhedrin* xi. 2. 4 ; *Horajath* i. 5, *fin.* In most of the passages the expression שְׁבִירַיָּשִׁים is added.

⁴⁶⁹ *Sanhedrin* i. 6 ; *Middoth* v. 4. Just as the term סְנֵה־דִּרְיָן is borrowed from the Greek, so on the Palmyra inscriptions we find the words ὁλᾶ ὁ δῆμος = ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος.

⁴⁷⁰ *Shebuoth* ii. 2.

^{470a} *Sota* ix. 11 ; *Kiddushin* iv. 5 ; *Sanhedrin* iv. 3. The term סְנֵה־דִּרְיָן (in a variety of senses) is also of frequent occurrence, especially in the later Targums. See Buxtorf's *Lex.* col. 1513f. Levy's *Chald. Wörterb.* under word

such a serious rebellion as had taken place. Hitherto, apart from the short episode in the time of Gabinius, the Roman system of provincial government had not been strictly carried out in Judaea (see above, § 17^e), but now that Palestine was reduced to the position of a dependent Roman province, it was no longer exempted from the ordinary system of Roman provincial administration.⁴⁷¹ From all this it followed, as matter of course, that a Jewish council, invested with such extensive powers as this one had hitherto exercised, could not possibly continue any longer. It is true, no doubt, that the Jewish people lost no time in again creating for themselves a new centre in the so-called court of justice (בֵּית דִּין) at Jabne.⁴⁷² But this court was something essentially different from the old Sanhedrim, inasmuch as it was not a legislative body, but a judicial tribunal, the decisions of which had at first nothing more than a merely theoretical importance. And although this court also came ere long to acquire great power over the Jewish people through exercising over them a real jurisdiction that was partly conceded and partly usurped,⁴⁷³ still Rabbinical Judaism has evidently never been able to get rid of the feeling that the old "Sanhedrim" had now become a thing of the past.⁴⁷⁴

⁴⁷¹ For the separation of Palestine from Syria and its elevation to the rank of an independent province, consult Kuhn, *Die städt. u. bürgerl. Verf.* ii. 183 f. Marquardt's *Staatsverwaltung*, i. (2nd ed. 1881) p. 419 ff.

⁴⁷² On this court at Jabne, see especially *Rosh hashana* ii. 8, 9, iv. 1, 2. *Sanhedrin* xi. 4; also *Bechoroth* iv. 5, vi. 8; *Kelim* v. 4; *Para* vii. 6. At a later period (in the third and fourth centuries) this centre of Rabbinical Judaism was located at Tiberias.

⁴⁷³ Origen, *Epist. ad Africanum*, sec. xiv. (*Opp.* ed. Lommatzsch, vol. xvii.): Καὶ νῦν γοῦν Ῥωμαίων βασιλευόντων καὶ Ἰουδαίων τὸ διδραχμον αὐτοῖς τελούντων, ὅσα συγχωροῦντος Καίσαρος ὁ ἑθνάρχης παρ' αὐτοῖς δύναται, ὡς μηδὲν διαφέρειν βασιλευόντος τοῦ ἔθνους, ἴσμεν οἱ πεπειραμένοι. Γίνεται δὲ καὶ κριτήρια λεληθότως κατὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ καταδικάζονται τινες τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ θανάτῳ, οὔτε μετὰ τῆς πάντη εἰς τοῦτο παρρησίας, οὔτε μετὰ τοῦ γανθάνειν τὸν βασιλεύοντα. Καὶ τοῦτο ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τοῦ ἔθνους πολὺν διατρίψαντες χρόνον μεμαθήκαμεν καὶ πεπληροφορήμεθα.

⁴⁷⁴ *Sota* ix. 11: "Ever since the Sanhedrim was extinguished (שֶׁכַּבְּתָה סֵנְהֶדְרִין) there has been no such thing as singing at the festive board, for it is written in Isa. xxiv. 9: 'They shall not drink wine with a song.'" etc.

2. *Its composition.* In accordance with the analogy of the later Rabbinical courts of justice, Jewish tradition conceives of the supreme Sanhedrim as having been merely a collegiate body composed of scribes. This is what, down to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, it certainly never was. On the contrary, it is certain, from the concurrent testimony of Josephus and the New Testament, that, till the very last, the head of the sacerdotal aristocracy continued to preside over the Sanhedrim. And so we see that all the vicissitudes of time had not been able to efface that original fundamental character of this court in virtue of which it was to be regarded not as an association of learned men, but as a body representative of the nobility. But, of course, it was not to be expected that the power of Pharisaism should continue to grow as it did without ultimately exerting some influence upon the composition of the Sanhedrim. The more the Pharisees grew in importance the more did the priestly aristocracy become convinced that they too would have to be allowed to have their representatives in the Sanhedrim. The first step in this direction would probably be taken some time during the reign of Alexandra, and the matter would doubtless receive no inconsiderable impetus in the time of Herod. For this monarch's high-handed treatment of the old nobility could not possibly have failed to promote the interests of Pharisaism. The Sanhedrim of the Roman period then would thus seem to have been made up of two factors: that of the priestly nobility, with its Sadducean sympathies on the one hand, and that of the Pharisaic doctors on the other. It is moreover in the light of this fact that the various matters recorded in the traditions will require to be viewed. According to the Mishna the number of members amounted to seventy-one, clearly taking as its model the council of elders in the time of Moses (Num. xi. 16).⁴⁷⁵ From the two statements of

⁴⁷⁵ *Sanhedrin* i. 6: "The supreme Sanhedrim consisted of seventy-one members." "The Sanhedrim of seventy-one" is also mentioned in *Sheboth* i. 2. In several other passages we read of seventy-two elders (*Sebachim*

Josephus, the one in *Antt.* xiv. 9. 4 (where we are told that Herod, on his accession to the throne, put to death *all* the members of the Sanhedrim), and the other in *Antt.* xv. 1. 2 (where again we are informed that he put to death the forty-five most prominent members of the party of Antigonus), one might be disposed to infer that the number of members was forty-five. But the *πάντας* in the first of those statements is assuredly not intended to be taken literally. On the other hand, we have a great deal that tends to bear out the view that the number of members amounted to seventy-one. When Josephus was planning the rising in Galilee he appointed seventy elders to take charge of the administration of this province.⁴⁷⁶ In like manner the zealots in Jerusalem, after suppressing the existing authorities, established a tribunal composed of seventy members.⁴⁷⁷ This then would seem to have been regarded as the normal number of members required to constitute a supreme court of justice among the Jews. Consequently the traditions of the Mishna too are in themselves perfectly probable. As to the mode in which

i. 3; *Jadajim* iii. 5, iv. 2). But, as a rule, these are foreign to the matter in hand. (In all the three passages last referred to R. Simon ben Asai appeals to traditions, which he professes to have received "from the mouth of the seventy-two elders on the day on which they ordained R. Eleazar ben Asariah as head of the school." Here then the matter in view is not the supreme Sanhedrim, but the academy of Jewish scholars in the second century of our era. Comp. besides, Selden, *De synedriis*, ii. 4. 10.) Just as little have we to do here with the supposed seventy-two translators of the Old Testament (six from each of the twelve tribes); see Pseudo-Aristeas, ed. M. Schmidt in Merx's *Archiv*, i. 262 f.

⁴⁷⁶ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 5. When Kuenen (*Verslagen en Mededeelingen*, x. 161) seeks to invalidate the appeal to this passage by pointing to the discrepancy between it and what is said in *Vita*, 14, he may be met with the reply that this latter passage has been purposely tampered with. The fact of Josephus having organized the rising in Galilee through the appointment of the seventy elders, has been so distorted in *Vita*, 14, as to make it appear that, under the pretext of friendship, he took the most distinguished of the Galilaeans "to the number of somewhere about seventy" and kept them as hostages, and allowed the judgments he pronounced to be regulated by their decisions.

⁴⁷⁷ *Bell. Jud.* iv. 5. 4. Comp. in general, Hody, *De biblicorum textibus originalibus*, pp. 126-128.

vacancies were filled up we know in reality absolutely nothing. But, judging from the aristocratic character of this body, we may venture to presume that there was not a new set of members every year, and those elected by the voice of the people, as in the case of the democratic councils in the Hellenistic communes, but that they held office for a longer period, nay perhaps for life, and that new members were appointed either by the existing members themselves or by the supreme political authorities (Herod and the Romans). The supplying of vacancies through co-optation is also presupposed in the Mishna, in so far as, after its own peculiar way no doubt, it regards the amount of Rabbinical learning possessed by the candidate as the sole test of his eligibility.⁴⁷⁸ In any case we may well believe that the *one* requirement of legal Judaism, that none but Israelites of pure blood should be eligible for the office of judge in a criminal court, would also be insisted on in the case of the supreme Sanhedrim.⁴⁷⁹ New members were formally admitted to take their seats through

⁴⁷⁸ *Sanhedrin* iv. 4: "In front of them sat three rows of learned disciples (חלמירי חכמים); each of them had his own special place. Should it be necessary to promote one of them to the office of judge, one of those in the foremost row was selected. His place was then supplied by one from the second row, while one from the third was in turn advanced to the second. This being done, some one was then chosen from the congregation to supply the vacancy thus created in the third row. But the person so appointed did not step directly into the place occupied by the one last promoted from the third row, but into the place that besemed one who was only newly admitted."

⁴⁷⁹ That the Sanhedrim was composed exclusively of Jews is simply a matter of course. But the Mishna specially insists on evidence of pure blood in the case of the *criminal judge*. *Sanhedrin* iv. 2: "Any one is qualified to act as a judge in civil causes. But none were competent to deal with criminal cases but priests, Levites, and *Israelites whose daughters it would be lawful for priests to marry*" (i.e. those who can furnish documentary evidence of their legitimate Israelitish origin, Derenbourg, p. 453: les Israélites pourvus des conditions nécessaires pour contracter mariage avec le sacerdoce, not as Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 114, erroneously renders it: those who have become allied by marriage to the stock of the priesthood). From this then it would appear that the Mishna presupposes that, in the case of every member of the Sanhedrim, his legitimate Israelitish descent is an admitted fact requiring no further confirmation (*Kiddushin* iv. 5). As this is a point in which the tendencies of the priesthood and Pharisaism coin-

the ceremony of the laying on of hands (סְמִיכָה).⁴⁸⁰ With regard to the different orders to which the members of the Sanhedrim belonged we have trustworthy information on that point in the concurrent testimony of the New Testament and Josephus. Both authorities are agreed in this, that the ἀρχιερεῖς in the literal sense of the word were the leading personages among them. In almost every instance in which the New Testament enumerates the different orders we find that the ἀρχιερεῖς are mentioned first.⁴⁸¹ Sometimes οἱ ἄρχοντες is substituted for this latter as being an interchangeable expression.⁴⁸² This is also the case in Josephus,

cided, it is, to say the least of it, probable that it was also given effect to in practice.

⁴⁸⁰ The verb סָמַךְ (to lay on the hands) is already to be met with in the Mishna in the sense of to install any one as a judge (*Sanhedrin* iv. 4). This ceremony is therefore, comparatively speaking, a very ancient one, seeing that it was also observed at a very early period in the Christian Church. Of course the act of laying on of the hands was not to be understood as conferring any special charisma, but (as in the case of the victim in the Old Testament) as indicating that something was being transferred to the individual in question, that an office, a place of authority, was being committed to him on the part of the person by whom the ceremony was performed. On the later Rabbinical סְמִיכָה, see Buxtorf's *Lex. Chald.* col. 1498 f. Selden, *De synedriis*, ii. 7. Vitringa, *De synagoga vetere*, p. 886 ff. Carpzov's *Apparatus*, p. 577 f. Jo. Chrph. Wolf, *Curæ philol. in Nov. Test.*, note on Acts vi. 6, and the literature quoted there (being in general expositors' notes on Acts vi. 6). Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. für Bibel und Talmud*, part ii. art. "Ordinirung."

⁴⁸¹ The following are the formulæ that are to be met with:—I. ἀρχιερεῖς, γραμματεῖς and πρεσβύτεροι (or with the two latter in reverse order), Matt. xxviii. 41; Mark xi. 27, xiv. 43, 53, xv. 1.—II. ἀρχιερεῖς and γραμματεῖς, Matt. ii. 4, xx. 18, xxi. 15; Mark x. 33, xi. 18, xiv. 1, xv. 31; Luke xxii. 2, 66, xxiii. 10.—III. ἀρχιερεῖς and πρεσβύτεροι, Matt. xxi. 23, xxvi. 3, 47, xxvii. 1, 3, 12, 20, xxviii. 11, 12; Acts iv. 23, xxiii. 14, xxv. 15.—IV. οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ τὸ συνέδριον ὅλον, Matt. xxvi. 59; Mark xiv. 55; Acts xxii. 30. As a rule then, the ἀρχιερεῖς occupy the foremost place. The instances in which they are not mentioned first (Matt. xvi. 21; Mark viii. 31; Luke ix. 22, xx. 19), or are omitted altogether (Matt. xxvi. 57; Acts vi. 12), are extremely rare.

⁴⁸² See in particular, Acts ix. 5 and 8 (ἄρχοντες, πρεσβύτεροι and γραμματεῖς) compared with iv. 23 (ἀρχιερεῖς and πρεσβύτεροι). Of course there are a couple of instances in which both οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες occur together (Luke xxiii. 13, xxiv. 20).

above all, who designates the supreme authorities in Jerusalem *either* by conjoining the ἀρχιερεῖς with the δυνατοῖς, the γνωρίμοις and the βουλῇ,⁴⁸³ or by substituting ἄρχοντες for ἀρχιερεῖς,⁴⁸⁴ but never by coupling the two *together at the same time*. On the other hand, the ἀρχιερεῖς often stand alone as being the leading personages in the Sanhedrim.⁴⁸⁵ And however difficult it may now be further to determine the exact significance of this term (on this see below, under No. iv.), there can, at all events, be no doubt whatever that it is the most prominent representatives of the priesthood that are here in view. We are therefore to understand that it was always this class that played a leading part in the conduct of affairs. But it is certain that, along with them, the γραμματεῖς, the professional lawyers, also exercised considerable influence in the Sanhedrim. Such other members as did not belong to one or other of the two special classes just referred to were known simply as πρεσβύτεροι, under which general designation both priests and laymen alike might be included (for the two categories in question, see the passages in the New Testament quoted in note 481). Now, as the ἀρχιερεῖς belonged chiefly if not exclusively to the party of the Sadducees, while the γραμματεῖς, on the other hand, adhered not less strongly to the sect of the Pharisees,⁴⁸⁶ it follows from all that we have just been saying that *Sadducees and Pharisees alike* had seats in the Sanhedrim (especially during the Romano-Herodian period with regard to which

⁴⁸³ Bell. Jud. ii. 14. 8: οἱ τε ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ δυνατοὶ τό τε γνωριμάτατον τῆς πόλεως. Bell. Jud. ii. 15. 2: οἱ δυνατοὶ σὺν τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι. Bell. Jud. ii. 15. 3: τοὺς τε ἀρχιερεῖς σὺν τοῖς γνωρίμοις. Bell. Jud. ii. 15. 6: τοὺς τε ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ τὴν βουλὴν. Bell. Jud. ii. 16. 2: οἱ τε ἀρχιερεῖς ἅμα τοῖς δυνατοῖς καὶ ἡ βουλὴ. Bell. Jud. ii. 17. 2: τῶν τε ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γνωρίμων. Bell. Jud. ii. 17. 3: οἱ δυνατοὶ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν καὶ τοῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων γνωρίμοις. Bell. Jud. ii. 17. 5: οἱ δυνατοὶ σὺν τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι. Bell. Jud. ii. 17. 6: τῶν δυνατῶν καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων.

⁴⁸⁴ Bell. Jud. ii. 16. 1: οἱ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων ἄρχοντες. Bell. Jud. ii. 17. 1: οἱ τε ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ βουλευταί. Bell. Jud. ii. 17. 1: τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἅμα τοῖς δυνατοῖς. Bell. Jud. ii. 21. 7: οἱ δυνατοὶ καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων τινές

⁴⁸⁵ For example, Bell. Jud. ii. 15. 3, 4, 16. 3, v. 1. 5, vi. 9. 3.

⁴⁸⁶ Acts v. 17. Joseph. Antt. xx. 9. 1.

alone can we be said to have any precise information). This is further corroborated by the express testimony of the New Testament and Josephus.⁴⁸⁷ During the period in question the greatest amount of influence was already practically in the hands of the Pharisees, with whose demands the Sadducees were obliged, however reluctantly, to comply, "as otherwise the people would not have tolerated them."⁴⁸⁸ This remark of Josephus gives us a deep insight into the actual position of matters, from which it would seem, that though *formally* under the leadership of the Sadduceean high priests, the Sanhedrim was by this time *practically* under the predominant influence of Pharisaism.⁴⁸⁹

There is a casual notice in Josephus which may perhaps be taken as pointing to the existence of an arrangement peculiar to the Hellenistico-Roman period. On one occasion when certain differences had arisen between the Jewish authorities and Festus the procurator about some alteration in the temple buildings, it appears that, with the concurrence of Festus, the Jews sent "the ten foremost persons among them and the high priest Ismael and the treasurer Helkias" as a deputation to Nero (*Antt.* xx. 8. 11: τοὺς πρῶτους δέκα καὶ Ἰσμάηλον τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ Ἑλκίαν τὸν γαζοφύλακα). Now, if by the πρῶτοι δέκα here we are to understand not merely the ten most distinguished persons generally, but men holding a specific *official* position, then we are bound to assume that they were no other than the *committee* consisting

⁴⁸⁷ The Sadducees, Acts iv. 1 ff., v. 17, xxiii. 6; Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 9. 1. The Pharisees, Acts v. 34, xxiii. 6. Comp. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 3; *Vita*, 38, 39.

⁴⁸⁸ *Antt.* xviii. 1. 4: ὅποτε γὰρ ἐπ' ἀρχαῖς παρέλθοιεν, ἀκουσίως μὲν καὶ κατ' ἀνάγκας, προσχωροῦσι δ' οὖν οἷς ὁ Φαρισαῖος λέγει, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἂν ἄλλως ἀνεκτοὺς γενέσθαι τοῖς πλήθεσιν.

⁴⁸⁹ From what is here said the combination of the ἀρχιερεῖς and Φαρισαῖοι, so frequently met with in the New Testament (*Matt.* xxi. 45, xxvii. 62; *John* vii. 32, 45, xi. 47, 57, xviii. 3), is quite in keeping with the actual state of things. A similar collocation is also to be met with in Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 3: συνελθόντες οὖν οἱ δυνατοὶ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν εἰς ταὐτὸ καὶ τοῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων γνωρίμοις. Comp. also, *Vita*, 38, 39.

of the δέκα πρῶτοι so often to be met with in the Hellenistic communes, and which can also be clearly shown to have had a place for example in the constitution established by Tiberias (see above, note 395). We are thus furnished with characteristic evidence of the extent to which Jewish and Hellenistico-Roman influences had become intertwined with each other in the organization of the Sanhedrim at the period in question.

As to who it was that acted as president of the Sanhedrim, this is a question in regard to which even Christian scholars down to most recent times and founding upon Jewish tradition, have entertained the most erroneous views conceivable. The later Jewish tradition, which as a rule regards the Sanhedrim in the light of a mere college of scribes, expressly presupposes that the heads of the Pharisaic schools were also the regular presidents of the Sanhedrim as well. Those heads of the schools are enumerated in the Mishna tractate *Aboth* c. i., and that with reference to earlier times, say from the middle of the second century B.C. till about the time of Christ, and are mentioned in pairs (see below, § 25); and it is asserted, though not in the tractate *Aboth*, yet in another passage in the Mishna, that the *first* of every pair had been *Nasi* (נָשִׂיא), while the *second* had been *Ab-beth-din* (אֲבֵית דִּין), i.e. according to later usage in regard to those titles: president and vice-president of the Sanhedrim.⁴⁹⁰ Further, the heads of the schools that come after the "pairs" just referred to, especially Gamaliel I. and his son Simon, are represented by the later traditions as having been presidents

⁴⁹⁰ *Chagiga* ii. 2: "Jose ben Joaser affirms that there should be no laying on of hands in the case of festival sacrifices, while Jose ben Jochanan says that it is quite permissible. Josua ben Perachja decided in the negative, Nittai (or Mattai) of Arbela in the affirmative. Juda ben Tabbai in the negative, Simon ben Schetach in the affirmative. Schemaja in the affirmative, Abtaljon in the negative. Hillel and Menachem were at one in their opinion; when Menachem withdrew and Schammai entered, Schammai pronounced in the negative, Hillel in the affirmative. Of those men the first of each pair was always a president and the second a supreme judge (הראשונים היו נשיאים ושנים להם אבית בית דין)."

of the Sanhedrim. In all this however there is, of course, nothing that is of any historical value.⁴⁹¹ On the contrary, according to the unanimous testimony of Josephus and the New Testament, it was always the high priest that acted as the head and president of the Sanhedrim. Speaking generally, we may say that this is only what was to be expected from the nature of the case itself. Ever since the commencement of the Greek period the high priest had uniformly acted as head of the nation as well. In like manner the Asmonaeans had also been high priests and princes, nay even kings at one and the same time. With regard to the Roman period, we have the express testimony of Josephus to the effect that the high priests were also the political heads of the nation (*Antt.* xx. 10, *fin.*: τὴν προστασίαν τοῦ ἔθνους οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐπεπίστευντο). In his theoretical descriptions of the Jewish constitution this historian invariably speaks of the high priest as having been the *supreme judge* (*Apion*, ii. 23: the high priest φυλάξει τοὺς νόμους, δικάσει περὶ τῶν ἀμφισβητουμένων, κολάσει τοὺς ἐλεγχθέντας ἐπ' ἀδίκῃ; *Antt.* iv. 8. 14: Moses is said to have ordained that, if the local courts were unable to decide a case, the parties were to go to Jerusalem, καὶ συνελθόντες ὁ τε ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ ὁ προφῆτης καὶ ἡ γερουσία τὸ δοκοῦν ἀποφαινέσθωσαν). Even from what is here stated we are required to assume that the high priest acted the part of president in the Sanhedrim. But, besides this, we have testimony of the most explicit kind to the same effect. In a document of so early a date as the national decree declaring the combined office of high priest and sovereign to be vested by right of inheritance in the family of Simon the Maccabaeus, it was ordained that nobody was to be allowed "to contradict his (Simon's) orders, or to convene an assembly in any part

⁴⁹¹ Comp. Kuenen as above, pp. 141–147; my article in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1872, pp. 614–619. Wellhausen's *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, pp. 29–43. Of the works belonging to an earlier date we would mention, in particular, Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, p. 1184 f., where the fact is already recognised that the high priest always acted as president of the Sanhedrim.

of the country without his knowledge or consent.”⁴⁹² In the few instances in which Josephus mentions the sittings of the Sanhedrim at all, we invariably find that the high priest occupied the position of president. Thus in the year 47 B.C. it was Hyrcanus II.,⁴⁹³ and in the year 62 A.D. it was Ananos the younger.⁴⁹⁴ Similarly in the New Testament, it is always the ἀρχιερεὺς that appears as the presiding personage (Acts v. 17 ff., vii. 1, ix. 1, 2, xxii. 5, xxiii. 2, 4, xxiv. 1).⁴⁹⁵ Wherever names are mentioned we find that it is the high priest for the time being that officiates as president. Thus we have Caiaphas in the time of Christ (Matt. xxvi. 3, 57), and Ananias in the time of the Apostle Paul (Acts xxiii. 2, xxiv. 1), both of whom, as we learn from Josephus, were the high priests actually in office at the dates in question. The trial of Jesus before Annas (John xviii.) cannot be regarded as in any way disproving this view. For there it was merely a question of private examination. As little can we lay any stress on the fact that Ananos (or Annas) the younger is represented as being at the head of affairs⁴⁹⁶ in the time of the war, and that long after he had been deposed.⁴⁹⁷ For the circumstance of his occupying that position then was due to the fact of a special decree of the people having been issued at the time at which the revolution broke out.⁴⁹⁸ The only passage that might be urged in opposition to our view is Acts iv. 6, where Annas (who was only an ex-high priest) is represented as being the president of the Sanhedrim. But this passage is very much in the same position as the parallel one, Luke iii. 2. In both Annas is mentioned *before* Caiaphas in such a way as might lead one to suppose that the *former* was

⁴⁹² 1 Macc. xiv. 44: ἀνταπεῖν τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ῥηθησομένοις καὶ ἐπισυστρέψαι συστροφὴν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ἀνευ αὐτοῦ.

⁴⁹³ Antt. xiv. 9. 3–5.

⁴⁹⁴ Antt. xx. 9. 1.

⁴⁹⁵ In answer to the strange view of Wieseler, that the president of the Sanhedrim merely *as such*, even though he were not a high priest, bore the title of ἀρχιερεὺς, see *Stud. u. Krit.* 1872, pp. 623–631.

⁴⁹⁶ Antt. xx. 9. 1.

⁴⁹⁷ Bell. Jud. ii. 20. 3, 22. 1, iv. 3. 7–5. 2; Vita, 38, 39, 44, 60.

⁴⁹⁸ Bell. Jud. ii. 20. 3.

the high priest actually in office, though in point of fact this was certainly not the case. If therefore we are not at liberty to infer from Luke iii. 2 that Annas was still in office as high priest, as little can we conclude from Acts iv. 6 that he was president of the Sanhedrim, which would be incompatible with Matt. xxvi. 57-66. We should prefer to explain the matter by saying that, in both cases, there is some inaccuracy about the narrative. That the persons who are mentioned in the Rabbinical traditions were not presidents of the Sanhedrim is further evident from the fact that, wherever those same individuals happen to be mentioned in the New Testament or by Josephus, they always appear merely as ordinary members of the court. Thus Shemaiah (Sameas) in the time of Hyrcanus II.,⁴⁹⁹ Gamaliel I. in the time of the apostles (Acts v. 34, comp. ver. 27), and Simon ben Gamaliel in the time of the Jewish war.⁵⁰⁰

The Jewish tradition in question is therefore at variance with the whole of the undoubted historical facts. Not only so, but it is itself only of a very late origin, and probably does not belong to so early a period as the age of the Mishna. The *one* solitary passage in the Mishna in which it occurs (*Chagiga* ii. 2) stands there in perfect isolation. Everywhere else in this work the heads of the schools above mentioned are spoken of simply as heads of schools and nothing more. Consequently it is extremely probable that the passage in question did not find its way into the text of the Mishna till some subsequent period.⁵⁰¹ Then again, it may be affirmed, unless we have been deceived on all hands, that the titles *Nasi* and *Ab-beth-din* as applied to the president and vice-president of the Sanhedrim are foreign as yet to the age of the Mishna. It is true both those *terms* are to be met with

⁴⁹⁹ *Antt.* xiv. 9. 3-5.

⁵⁰⁰ *Vita*, 38, 39.

⁵⁰¹ Later interpolations in the text of the Mishna may also be detected elsewhere, for example at *Aboth* v. 21. Of course the passage *Chagiga* ii. 2 already occurs in the Jerusalem Talmud, and so must be older at least than this latter.

in this work.⁵⁰² But by *Nasi* it is always the actual *prince* of the nation, specially the *king*, that is meant, as indeed, is on one occasion expressly affirmed,⁵⁰³ while the *Ab-beth-din* again, if we may judge from its literal import, can hardly have been intended to mean anything else than the *president* of the supreme court of justice (and therefore of the Sanhedrim). Besides this latter title, we sometimes meet with that of *Rosh-beth-din*, and with precisely the same meaning.⁵⁰⁴ It was not till the post-Mishnic age that the titles *Nasi* and *Ab-beth-din* were, so to speak, reduced a step by being transferred to the president and vice-president respectively.⁵⁰⁵ Finally, the so-called מופלג, who, on the strength of a few passages in the Talmud is also frequently mentioned by Jewish and Christian scholars as having been a special functionary of the court, was not so at all, but simply the most "prominent" of its ordinary members, i.e. the one who was most learned in the law.⁵⁰⁶

As regards the time of Christ it may be held as certain, from all that has just been said, that the office of president was always occupied by *the high priest for the time being*, and that too in virtue of his being such.

3. *Its jurisdiction.* As regards the area over which the

⁵⁰² נָשִׂיא, *Taanith* ii. 1; *Nedarim* v. 5; *Horajoth* ii. 5-7, iii. 1-3 and elsewhere. אֶבְיֵית דִּין, *Taanith* ii. 1; *Edujoth* v. 6.

⁵⁰³ *Horajoth* iii. 3.

⁵⁰⁴ *Rosh hashana* ii. 7, iv. 4.

⁵⁰⁵ The first Rabbinical president of the Sanhedrim to whom the title *Nasi* is applied is R. Judah, the redactor of the Mishna, at the end of the second century of our era (*Aboth* ii. 2). Of the Rabbins that occupied this position previous to R. Judah, there is not one that is known as yet under the designation of *Nasi* (apart from *Chagiga* ii. 2). We may assume therefore that the title did not come into use till toward the close of the Mishnic age.

⁵⁰⁶ The expression מופלג של בית דין occurs only once in the Mishna, *Horajoth* i. 4. In that passage directions are given as to what is to be done in the event of the court having arrived at an erroneous decision in the absence of the מופלג של בית דין, i.e. the most distinguished, most eminent member of the collegium. For the meaning of מופלג, comp. Buxtorf's *Lex.* col. 1729 f. Levy's *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* under word.

jurisdiction of the supreme Sanhedrim extended, it has been already remarked above (p. 142) that its *civil* authority was restricted, in the time of Christ, to the eleven toparchies of Judaea proper. And accordingly, for this reason, it had no judicial authority over Jesus Christ so long as He remained in Galilee. It was only as soon as He entered Judaea that He came directly under its jurisdiction. In a certain sense, no doubt, the Sanhedrim exercised such jurisdiction over *every* Jewish community in the world, and in that sense over Galilee as well. Its orders were regarded as binding throughout the entire domain of orthodox Judaism. It had power, for example, to issue warrants to the congregations (synagogues) in Damascus for the apprehension of the Christians in that quarter (Acts ix. 2, xxii. 5, xxvi. 12). At the same time however the extent to which the Jewish communities were willing to yield obedience to the orders of the Sanhedrim always depended on how far they were favourably disposed toward it. It was only within the limits of Judaea proper that it exercised any direct authority. There could not possibly be a more erroneous way of defining the extent of its jurisdiction as regards the kind of causes with which it was competent to deal than to say that it was the *spiritual* or *theological* tribunal in contradistinction to the civil judicatories of the Romans. On the contrary, it would be more correct to say that it formed, in contrast to the foreign authority of Rome, that *supreme native* court which here, as almost everywhere else, the Romans had allowed to continue as before, only imposing certain restrictions with regard to competency. To this tribunal then belonged all those judicial matters and all those measures of an administrative character which either could not be competently dealt with by the inferior local courts or which the Roman procurator had not specially reserved for himself. The Sanhedrim was, above all, the final court of appeal for questions connected with the Mosaic law, but not in the sense that it was open to any one to appeal to it against the decisions of the inferior courts, but rather in so far

as it was called upon to intervene in every case in which the lower courts could not agree as to their judgment.⁵⁰⁷ And when once it had given a decision in any case the judges of the local courts were, on pain of death, bound to acquiesce in it.⁵⁰⁸ In the theoretical speculations of the scribes we find the following specially laid down as cases which are to belong to the jurisdiction of the supreme court of justice: "A tribe (charged with idolatry), or a false prophet, or a high priest is only to be tried before the court of the seventy-one. A voluntary war is only to be commenced after the decision of the court of the seventy-one has been given regarding it. There is to be no enlargement of the city (Jerusalem or the courts of the temple) till after the court of the seventy-one has decided the matter. Superior courts for the tribes are only to be instituted when sanctioned by the court of the seventy-one. A town that has been seduced into idolatry is only to be dealt with by the court of the seventy-one."⁵⁰⁹ Accordingly the high priest might be tried by the Sanhedrim,⁵¹⁰ though the king, on the other hand, was as little amenable to its authority as he was at liberty to become one of its members.⁵¹¹ At the same time it is not difficult to perceive that all the regulations just referred to have the air of being of a purely theoretical character, that they do not represent the actual state of things, but merely the devout imaginations of the Mishnic doctors. The facts to be gleaned from the pages of the New Testament are of a somewhat more valuable character. We know, as matter of fact, that Jesus appeared before the Sanhedrim charged with blasphemy (Matt. xxvi. 65; John xix. 7), and that, before this same tribunal, Peter and John were brought up charged with being false prophets and deceivers of the people (Acts iv. and v.), Stephen

⁵⁰⁷ *Antt.* iv. 8. 14, *fin.*; *Sanhedrin* xi. 2 (see the passage as quoted above, p. 142).

⁵⁰⁸ *Sanhedrin* xi. 2.

⁵⁰⁹ *Sanhedrin* i. 5. *Comp. Sanhedrin* ii. 4: "If the king is disposed to enter upon an unprovoked war, he is at liberty to do so only after the decision of the council of the seventy-one has been given."

⁵¹⁰ See also *Sanhedrin* i. 1.

⁵¹¹ *Sanhedrin* ii. 2.

with being a blasphemer (Acts vi. 13 ff.), and Paul with being guilty of transgressing the Mosaic law (Acts xxiii.).⁵¹²

There is a special interest attaching to the question as to how far the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim was limited by the authority of the Roman procurator.⁵¹³ We accordingly proceed to observe that, inasmuch as the Roman system of provincial government was not strictly carried out in the case of Judaea (see above, § 17°), as the simple fact of its being administered by means of a procurator plainly shows, the Sanhedrim was still left in the enjoyment of a comparatively high degree of independence. Not only did it exercise civil jurisdiction, and that according to *Jewish* law (which was only a matter of course, as otherwise a Jewish court of justice would have been simply inconceivable), but it also enjoyed a considerable amount of criminal jurisdiction as well. It had an independent authority in regard to police affairs, and consequently possessed the right of ordering arrests to be made by its own officers (Matt. xxvi. 47; Mark xiv. 43; Acts iv. 3, v. 17, 18).⁵¹⁴ It had also the power of finally disposing, on

⁵¹² The series of cases being the same as in Winer's *Realwörterb.* ii. 552.

⁵¹³ On this point, comp. Bynaeus, *De morte Jesu Christi*, iii. 1. 9–14. Deyling, *De Judaeorum jure gladii tempore Christi*, ad John xviii. 31 (*Observationes sacrae*, part ii. 1737, pp. 414–428; also in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxvi.). Iken, *De jure vitae et necis tempore mortis Servatoris apud Judaeos non amplius superstite* ad John xviii. 31 (in his *Dissertatt. philol.-theol.* ii. 517–572). A. Balth. v. Walther, *Juristisch-historische Betrachtungen ueber die Geschichte vom Leiden und Sterben Jesu Christi*, etc., Breslau 1777, pp. 142–168 (this latter work I know only through the quotation from it in Lücke's *Commentar ueber das Ev. Joh.*, ii. 736; for more of the earlier literature, see Wolf's *Curae philol. in Nov. Test.*, note on John xviii. 31). Winer's *Realwörterb.* ii. 553. Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. xv. 320–322. Döllinger's *Christenthum und Kirche in der Zeit der Grundlegung* (2nd ed. 1868), pp. 456–460. Langen in the *Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.* 1862, pp. 411–463. On the judicial arrangements in the Roman provinces generally see Geib, *Geschichte des römischen Criminalprocesses* (1842), pp. 471–486. Rudorff, *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. ii., especially pp. 12 and 345.

⁵¹⁴ According to Matt. xxvi. 47, Mark xiv. 43, it was by the *Jewish* police that Jesus was arrested. It is only in the fourth Gospel that it seems to be implied that it was a Roman tribune (officer) with his cohort that apprehended Jesus (John xviii. 3 and 12).

its own authority, of such cases as did not involve sentence of death (Acts iv. 5–23, v. 21–40). It was only in cases in which such sentence of death was pronounced that the judgment required to be ratified by the authority of the procurator. Not only is this expressly affirmed with regard to the Jews in the Gospel of John (xviii. 31. ἡμῶν οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀποκτεῖναι οὐδένα), but it follows as matter of certainty, from the account of the condemnation of Jesus as given by the Synop- tists. Besides, a reminiscence of this fact has survived in the Jewish traditions.⁵¹⁵ But it is at the same time a fact worthy of note, that the procurator regulated his judgment in accordance with *Jewish* law; only on this assumption could Pilate have pronounced sentence of death in the case of Jesus. It is true the procurator was not compelled to have any regard to Jewish law in the matter at all, but still he was at *liberty* to do so, and as a rule he actually did so. *There was one special offence in regard to which the Jews had been accorded the singular privilege of proceeding even against Roman citizens according to Jewish law.* For if on any occasion one who was not a Jew happened to pass the barrier at the temple in Jerusalem, beyond which only Jews could go, and thus intrude into the inner court, he was punished with death, and that even though he were a Roman.⁵¹⁶ Of course, even in this latter case, it was necessary that the sentence of the Jewish court should be confirmed by the Roman procurator. For we can hardly

⁵¹⁵ *Jer. Sanhedrin* i. 1 (fol. 18^a) and vii. 2 (fol. 24^b): "The right of pronouncing sentences of life or death was taken from Israel (ניטלו דיניו) (נפשות מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל) forty years before the destruction of the temple." The date of the withdrawal here given is, of course, worthless, for it may be assumed as certain that this did not merely occur for the first time when Pilate was procurator, but that in fact no such right could be said to have belonged to the Jews ever since Judaea came to be under procurators at all.

⁵¹⁶ *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 4: Titus puts to the besieged the following question: Did we not grant you permission to put to death any one who went beyond the barrier, even though he were a Roman? (οὐχ ἡμεῖς δὲ τοὺς ὑπερβάντας ὑμῶν ἀναρρεῖν ἐπετρέψαμεν, καὶ Ῥωμαίων τις ἦ;). On this comp. also § 24, below. The subjecting of Roman citizens to the laws of a foreign city is an *extraordinary concession*, which, as a rule, was made only in the case of those communities which were recognised as *liberae*. See Khun, *Die*

venture to infer, from the terms used by Josephus in speaking of this matter, that in this special instance, though in this alone, the Jews had an absolute right to carry out the capital sentence on their own authority. Nor would we be justified in drawing any such inference from the stoning of Stephen (Acts vii. 5 ff.). This latter is rather to be regarded either as a case of excess of jurisdiction, or as an act of irregular mob-justice. Still, on the other hand, it would be a mistake to assume, as a statement in Josephus might seem to warrant us in doing, that the Sanhedrim was not at liberty to meet at all without the consent of the procurator.⁵¹⁷ But all that is meant by the statement in question is that the high priest had no right to hold a court of *supreme jurisdiction* in the absence and without the consent of the procurator. As little are we to assume that the Jewish authorities were required to hand over every offender in the first instance to the procurator. This they no doubt did if at any time it seemed to them to be expedient to do so,⁵¹⁸ but that does not necessarily imply that they were bound to do it. We see then that the Sanhedrim had been left in the enjoyment of a tolerably extensive jurisdiction, the most serious restriction to it being, of course, the fact that the Roman authorities could at any time take the initiative themselves, and proceed independently of the Jewish court, as they actually did in not a few instances, as, for example, when Paul was arrested. Further, it was in the power, not only of the procurator, but even of the tribune of the cohorts stationed in Jerusalem, to call the Sanhedrim

städtische und bürgerl. Verfassung, ii. 24. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. 75 f., and especially the decree of the Roman senate with reference to Chios passed in the year 674 A.U.C. = 80 B.C. (*Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 2222): *οἱ τε παρ' αὐτοῖς ὄντες Ῥωμαῖοι τοῖς Χείων ὑπακούουσιν νόμοις*. This concession then was accorded to the Jews, at least as far as the particular case in question was concerned.

⁵¹⁷ *Antt.* xx. 9. 1: *οὐκ ἐξόν ἢν Ἀνάνη χωρὶς τῆς ἐκείνου γνώμης καθίσαι συνέδριον*.

⁵¹⁸ In the time of Albinus, for example, the Jewish *ἀρχοντες* delivered to the procurator a certain lunatic, whose behaviour seemed to them to be of a dangerous character (*Bell. Jud.* vii. 5. 3, ed. Bekker, p. 104, lin. 6 ff.).

together for the purpose of submitting to it any matter requiring to be investigated from the standpoint of Jewish law (Acts xx. 30 ; comp. xxiii. 15, 20, 28).

4. *The time and place of meeting.* The local courts usually sat on the *second* and *fifth* days of the week (Monday and Thursday).⁵¹⁹ Whether this was also the practice in the case of the supreme Sanhedrim we have no means of knowing. There were no courts held on festival days (יום טוב), much less on the Sabbath.⁵²⁰ As in criminal cases a capital sentence could not be pronounced till the day following the trial, it was necessary to take care not to allow cases of this nature to be concluded on the evening preceding the Sabbath or any festival day.⁵²¹ Of course all those regulations were, in the first instance, of a purely theoretical character, and, as we know from what took place in the case of Jesus, were by no means strictly adhered to. The *place* in which the supreme Sanhedrim was in the habit of meeting (the βουλή) was situated, according to Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* v. 4. 2, close to the so-called Xystos, and that on the east side of it, in the direction of the temple mount. Now, seeing that, according to *Bell. Jud.* ii. 16. 3, there was nothing but a bridge between the Xystos and this latter, it is probable that the βουλή was to be found upon the temple mount itself, on the western side of the enclosing wall. In any case, it must have stood outside the upper part of the city, for, according to *Bell. Jud.* vi. 6. 3, we find that the Romans had destroyed the βουλευτήριον (= βουλή) before they had as yet got possession of the upper part of the city. The Mishna repeatedly mentions the לְשַׁבֵּת הַנְּיִית as the place where the supreme Sanhedrim held its sittings.⁵²²

⁵¹⁹ *Kethuboth* i. 1.

⁵²⁰ Beza (or *Jom tob*), v. 2. Comp. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. xiii. 203 (art. "Sabbath"). Bleek's *Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik* (1846), p. 141 ff.; Wieseler's *Chronologische Synopse*, p. 361 ff. Kirchner, *Die jüdische Passahfeier und Jesu letztes Mahl* (Program. for the Gymnasium at Duisburg, 1870), p. 57 ff.

⁵²¹ *Sanhedrin* iv. 1, *fin.*

⁵²² *Sanhedrin* xi. 2; *Middoth* v. 4. Comp. *Pea* ii. 6; *Eduyoth* vii. 4.

Now, seeing that its statements cannot possibly refer to any other period than that of Josephus, and considering, moreover, that by the *βουλή* of this historian we are undoubtedly to understand the meeting-place of the supreme Sanhedrim, we must necessarily identify the *לְשַׁכַּת הַנְּזִיחַ* with the *βουλή* of Josephus. It may be presumed therefore that the designation *לְשַׁכַּת הַנְּזִיחַ* was not meant to imply (as has been commonly supposed) that the hall in question was built of hewn stones (*נְזִיחַ* = hewn stones),—which could hardly be regarded as a characteristic feature,—but that it stood beside the Xystos (*נְזִיחַ* = *ξυστός*, as in the Sept. 1 Chron. xxii. 2; Amos v. 11). To distinguish it from the other *לְשַׁכּוֹת* on the temple esplanade it was called, from its situation, “the hall beside the Xystos.” It is true that the Mishna represents it as having been within the inner court.⁵²³ But, considering how untrustworthy and sometimes inaccurate are its statements elsewhere regarding the topography of the temple, the testimony of the Mishna cannot be supposed to invalidate the result arrived at above, especially as it happens to be corroborated by other circumstances besides.⁵²⁴ We may regard as utterly useless here the later Talmudic statement, to the effect that, forty years

⁵²³ See *Middoth* v. 4 in particular; also *Sanhedrin* xi. 2. In the Babylonian Gemara, *Joma* xx.^a, it is stated somewhat more circumstantially that the *לְשַׁכַּת הַנְּזִיחַ* stood one half within, and the other half without the court (see the passage, for example, in Buxtorf's *Lex. Chald.* under *נְזִיחַ*). *Pea* ii. 6 and *Edujoth* vii. 4 cannot be said to furnish any data for enabling us to determine the site of the building; as little have we any in *Tamid* ii. *fin.*, iv. *fin.* For although, according to the two last-mentioned passages, the priests were in the habit of betaking themselves to the *לְשַׁכַּת הַנְּזִיחַ* during the intervals between the various parts of the service, for the purpose of casting the lots and of repeating the *schma*, it does not necessarily follow from this that the building was situated within the court.

⁵²⁴ In the tractate *Joma* i. 1 mention is made of a *לְשַׁכַּת פְּרָהֲרִין* (as we ought to read with *Cod. de Rossi* 138, instead of the *לְשַׁכַּת פְּלֶהֲרִין* of the printed editions), by which we are undoubtedly to understand the place in which the supreme Sanhedrim met (*פְּרָהֲרִין* = *πράεδροι*); and it is, to say the least of it, most in harmony with the context (comp. i. 5) to regard it as having been outside the court. But the truth is, it is in itself somewhat unlikely that any portion of the inner court would be used for purposes other than those connected with the temple services.

before the destruction of the temple, the Sanhedrim had either removed or had been ejected (נלתה) from the *lischkath hagasith*, and that after that it held its sittings in the *chanujoth* (חנויות) or in a *chanuth* (חנות), a merchant's shop.⁵²⁵ This view must be completely dismissed, for the simple reason that no trace of it is as yet to be met with in the pages of the Mishna, which, on the contrary, obviously presupposes that the Sanhedrim still held its sittings in the *lischkath hagasith* on the very eve of the destruction of the temple. As it so happens that the forty years immediately preceding the destruction of the temple are also regarded as the period during which the Sanhedrim had ceased to have the right to pronounce a capital sentence (see above, note 515), it is probable that what the Talmudic statement in question means, is that during the period just referred to the Sanhedrim was no longer at liberty, or was no longer inclined, to hold its sittings in the usual official court-house, but met in some obscure place, *i.e.* in "the merchant's shops," or, as the reading with the singular *chanuth* is perhaps to be preferred, in a "merchant's shop." For חנוית is the ordinary word for a shop with an arched roof, a merchant's shop.⁵²⁶ As in one instance it is stated that the Sanhedrim subsequently removed from the *chanuth* into Jerusalem,⁵²⁷ probably we are to conceive of that building as having been outside the city proper. But all further conjectures on the part of scholars as to where it stood are superfluous, for the thing itself is in the main

⁵²⁵ *Shabbath* xv.^a; *Rosh hashana* xxxi.^a; *Sanhedrin* xii.^a; *Aboda sara* viii.^b In the edition of the Talmud now before me (Amsterdam 1644 ff.) it is only in the first-mentioned passage (*Shabbath* xv.^a) that the plural *chanujoth* occurs, the singular *chanuth* being used in the other three instances. See besides the passages in Selden's *De synedriis*, ii. 15. 7-8; Wagenseil's note on *Sota* ix. 11 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, iii. 297); Levy's *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* ii. 80 (see under חנוית).

⁵²⁶ For example, see *Baba kamma* ii. 2, vi. 6; *Baba mezia* ii. 4, iv. 11; *Baba bathra* ii. 3. For the plural חנויות, see *Taanith* i. 6; *Baba mezia* viii. 6; *Aboda sara* i. 4; *Tohoroth* vi. 3. The shopkeeper or dealer was called חנוני.

⁵²⁷ *Rosh hashana* xxxi.^a

unhistorical.⁵²⁸ Although on the occasion on which Jesus was condemned to death (Mark xiv. 53 ff.; Matt. xxvi. 57 ff.) the Sanhedrim happened to meet in the *palace of the high priest*, we must regard this as an exception to the rule, rendered necessary by the simple fact of its having met during the night. For at night the gates of the temple mount were shut.⁵²⁹

5. *Judicial procedure.* This, according to the account of it given in the Mishna, was as follows.⁵³⁰ The members of the court sat in a semicircle (בִּהְצֵי נֹחַץ עֲנִילָה, literally, like the half of a circular threshing-floor), in order that they might be able to see each other. In front of them stood the two clerks of the court, one on the right hand and the other on the left, whose duty it was to record the votes of those who were in favour of acquittal on the one hand, and of those who were in favour of a sentence of condemnation on the other.⁵³¹ There also sat in front of them

⁵²⁸ The above explanation of the origin of the unhistorical statement in question now appears to me to be the most probable of any. For another see *Stud. u. Krit.* 1878, p. 625. Even so early as in the Talmud we find nothing but a fluctuating indecision as to the motives which led the Sanhedrim to remove from the usual place of meeting; see *Aboda sara* viii.^b, or the German translation in Ferd. Christian Ewald, *Aboda Sarah, oder der Götzendienst* (2nd ed. 1868), pp. 62–64.

⁵²⁹ *Middoth* i. 1. We have no evidence of any other meeting of the Sanhedrim ever having been held in the high priest's palace. For in Luke xxii. 54 ff. and John xviii. 13 ff., what we have to do with is simply a preliminary investigation before the high priest. And as for the statement with regard to the place of meeting in Matt. xxvi. 3, it is only to be regarded as a subsequent addition on the part of the evangelist, comp. Mark xiv. 1; Luke xxii. 2. For a fuller discussion of the question as to where the supreme Sanhedrim held its sittings, see my article in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1878, pp. 608–626. See also, at p. 608 of the same, the earlier literature of the subject, in which however no decisive results have been reached owing to the uncritical way in which it has dealt with the sources.

⁵³⁰ On the forms of judicial procedure in the Old Testament, see Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Gericht;" Oehler's art. "Gericht und Gerichtsverwaltung bei den Hebräern," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. v. pp. 57–61. Saalschütz, *Das Mosaische Recht*, ii. 593 ff. Keil, *Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie* (2nd ed. 1875), sec. 150. Köhler, *Lehrbuch der biblischen Geschichte*, i. 359 ff.

⁵³¹ *Sanhedrin* iv. 3. There is also one instance in Josephus in which ἡ γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς is mentioned, *Bell. Jud.* v. 13. 1.

three rows of the disciples of the learned men, each of whom had his own special seat assigned him.⁵³² The prisoner at the bar was always required to appear in a humble attitude and dressed in mourning.⁵³³ In cases involving a capital sentence, special forms were prescribed for conducting the trial and pronouncing the sentence. On such occasions it was the practice always to hear the reasons in favour of acquittal in the first place, which being done, those in favour of a conviction might next be stated.⁵³⁴ When any one had once spoken in favour of the accused he was not at liberty afterwards to say anything unfavourable to him, though the converse was permissible.⁵³⁵ Those of the student disciples who happened to be present were also allowed to speak, though only in favour of and not against the prisoner, while on other occasions not involving a capital sentence they could do either the one or the other as they thought proper.⁵³⁶ A sentence of acquittal might be pronounced on the same day as that of the trial, whereas a sentence of condemnation could not be pronounced till the following day.⁵³⁷ The voting, in the course of which each individual stood up in his turn,⁵³⁸ began "at the side," *בְּצֵד הַיָּמִין*, i.e. with the youngest member of the court, whereas on other occasions it was the practice to commence with the most distinguished member.⁵³⁹ For a sentence of acquittal a simple majority was sufficient, while for one of condemnation again a majority of two was required.⁵⁴⁰ If therefore twelve of the twenty-three judges necessary to form a quorum voted for acquittal and eleven for a conviction, then the prisoner was discharged; but if, on the other hand, twelve were for a conviction and eleven for acquittal, then in that case the number

⁵³² *Sanhedrin* iv. 4.

⁵³³ *Joseph. Antt.* xiv. 9. 4. *Comp. Sacharja* 3. 3.

⁵³⁴ *Sanhedrin* iv. 1.

⁵³⁵ *Sanhedrin* iv. 1, v. 5.

⁵³⁶ *Sanhedrin* iv. 1, v. 4.

⁵³⁷ *Sanhedrin* iv. 1, v. 5. On this ground many have sought to account for the alleged twofold meeting of the Sanhedrim when Jesus was condemned to death.

⁵³⁸ *Sanhedrin* v. 5.

⁵³⁹ *Sanhedrin* iv. 2.

⁵⁴⁰ *Sanhedrin* iv. 1.

of the judges had to be increased by the addition of two to their number, which was repeated if necessary until either an acquittal was secured or the majority requisite for a conviction was obtained. But, of course, they had to restrict themselves to the maximum number of seventy-one.⁵⁴¹

IV. THE HIGH PRIESTS.

THE LITERATURE.

Selden, *De successione in pontificatum Ebraeorum*, lib. i. cap. 11-12 (frequently printed along with Selden's other works; for example, in the edition of the *Uxor Ebraica*, Francof. ad Od. 1673; also in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xii.).

Lightfoot, *Ministerium templi Hierosolymitani*, c. iv. 3 (*Opp.* ed. Roterodam. i. 684 ff.).

Reland, *Antiquitates sacrae*, par. ii. c. 2 (ed. Lips. 1724, p. 146 f.).

Anger, *De temporum in actis apostolorum ratione* (1833), p. 93 f.

Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. vi. 3rd ed. 1868, p. 634.

Schürer, *Die ἀρχιεπίς im Neuen Testamente* (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1872, pp. 593-657).

Grätz, *Monatsschr. für Geschichte und Wissensch. des Judenthums*, Jahrg. 1877, pp. 450-464, and Jahrg. 1881, pp. 49-64, 97-112.

The most distinctive feature of the Jewish constitution as it existed during the period subsequent to the exile is this, that the *high priest was the political head of the nation as well*. That he was so at least from the commencement of the Greek era down to the days of the Romano-Herodian rule is regarded as entirely beyond dispute. The high priests of the pre-Maccabaeon age as well as those of the Asmonaeon line were not only *priests*, but also *princes* at one and the same time. And although their authority was restricted on the one hand by the Greek suzerains, and on the other by the *gerousia*, still it was very greatly strengthened by the fact that their high office was *hereditary and tenable for life*. The combination of priesthood and royalty as seen in the case of the later Asmonaeons represented the very acme of sacerdotal power and authority. After the Romans came upon the

⁵⁴¹ *Sanhedrin* v. 5.

scene, and still more under the Herodian princes, they of course lost much of their power. The Asmonaeon dynasty was overthrown, nay was extirpated altogether. The principle of inheritance and life-tenure was done away with. High priests were appointed and deposed at pleasure by Herod and the Romans alike. In addition to this, there was the steady increase of the power of Pharisaism and the Rabbinical school. But even in spite of the combined influence of all the factors we have mentioned, the high-priesthood contrived to retain a considerable share of its original power down to the time of the destruction of the temple. And even after that the high priests continued to act as presidents of the Sanhedrim, and consequently to have the chief direction of the civil affairs of the community as well. Even then there still remained a few privileged families from which the high priests continued to be almost always selected. And accordingly, although under the supreme rule of the Romans and the Herodian princes they no longer formed, it may be, a monarchical dynasty, they yet continued to exist as an influential aristocracy. As we are familiar, from political history, with the series of high priests down to the overthrow of the Asmonaeans, it will be sufficient at present merely to subjoin a list of those belonging to the Romano-Herodian period. Josephus tells us that they numbered twenty-eight in all.⁵⁴² Accordingly on collating his different notices with regard to them, we get the following twenty-eight names:—⁵⁴³

⁵⁴² *Antt.* xx. 10.

⁵⁴³ A list of those high priests, based on the notices found in Josephus, has already been framed by several Greek divines, viz. (1) by Josephus the Christian in his *Hypomnesticum s. liber memorialis*, chap. ii. (first edited by Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigraphus Vet. Test.*, vol. ii., and afterwards given in Gallendi's *Biblioth. Patrum*, vol. xiv., and Migne's *Patrol. graec.*, vol. cvi.); (2) by Nicephorus Constantinop. in his *Chronographia compendiaris*, or rather according to De Boor, by the author of the revised version of this *Chronography* (critical edition by Credner in two programs for the University of Giessen, 1832-1838, ii. 33 f., and especially by De Boor, *Nicephori Const. opuscula*, Lips. 1880, pp. 110-112). Then Zonaras, who inserts extracts from Josephus into the first six books of his *Annals*,

(a) Appointed by Herod (37-4 B.C.):—

1. Ananel (37-36 B.C.), a native of Babylon, and belonging to an obscure priestly family, *Antt.* xv. 2. 4, 3. 1. The Rabbinical traditions represent him as having been an Egyptian.⁵⁴⁴
2. Aristobulus, the last of the Asmonaeans (35 B.C.), *Antt.* xv. 3. 1, 3.

Ananel for the second time (34 ff. B.C.), *Antt.* xv. 3. 3.

3. Jesus the son of Phabes, *Antt.* xv. 9. 3.⁵⁴⁵
4. Simon the son of Boethos, or according to other accounts, *Boethos* himself, in any case the father-in-law of Herod, he having been the father of Mariamne II. (some time between 24 and 25 B.C.), *Antt.* xv. 9. 3, xvii. 4. 2. Comp. xviii. 5. 1, xix. 6. 2. The family belonged originally to Alexandria, *Antt.* xv. 9. 3.

has also adopted the passages about the high priests almost entirely (*Annal.* v. 12-vi. 17). The part referring to the high priests in the time of Jesus (Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 2. 2) is also quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* i. 10. 5-6, and *Demonstr. evang.* viii. 2. 100; in like manner in the *Chron. paschale*, ed. Dindorf, i. 417. Of the modern lists the most correct is that of Anger, with which our own entirely agrees. For a fuller treatment of the matter, see my article in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1872, pp. 597-607.

⁵⁴⁴ In the Mishna, *Para* iii. 5, those high priests are enumerated under whom a red heifer had been burnt (in compliance with the enactment of Num. xix.). In the post-Asmonaeon age this took place under the three following:—(1) Elioenai ben ha-Kajaph, (2) Chanamel the Egyptian, (3) Ismael ben Pi-abi (אליעזרי בן חקיה וחנמאל המצרי וישמעאל בן פי אבי), the orthography of the names according to *Cod. de Rossi* 138). Chanamel the Egyptian can have been no other than our *Ananel*. There can hardly be a doubt that the form of the name is just as inaccurate as is the statement to the effect that he was an Egyptian. Moreover, the chronological order is incorrect, for by the Elioenai, who is mentioned first, no other can have been intended than Elionaios the son of Kantheras, whose name occurs much farther down the list (No. 19). As for the rest, the term "Egyptian" is simply equivalent to Alexandrian, which other high priests of the time of Herod actually were, as for example the sons of Boethos (*Antt.* xv. 9. 3).

⁵⁴⁵ In Joseph. *Hypomnest.* Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Φαυβῆ, Zonaras. *Annal.* v. 16 (Bonnens. i. 433), Φάβητος, as in Josephus the Jew.

5. Matthias the son of Theophilos (5-4 B.C.), *Antt.* xvii. 4. 2, 6. 4.
6. Joseph the son of Ellem, *Antt.* xvii. 6. 4.⁵⁴⁶
7. Joasar the son of Boethos (4 B.C.), *Antt.* xvii. 6. 4.
- (b) Appointed by Archelaus (4 B.C.-6 A.D.) :—
 8. Eleasar the son of Boethos (4 ff.), *Antt.* xvii. 13. 1.
 9. Jesus the son of Σεέ, *Antt.* xvii. 13. 1.⁵⁴⁷
Joasar for the second time, *Antt.* xviii. 1. 1, 2. 1.
- (c) Appointed by Quirinus (A.D. 6) :—
 10. Ananos or Hannas the son of Seth (6-15 A.D.), *Antt.* xviii. 2. 1, 2. Comp. xx. 9. 1; *Bell. Jud.* v. 12. 2. This is the high priest so well known in the New Testament, Luke iii. 2; John xviii. 13-24; Acts iv. 6.
- (d) Appointed by Valerius Gratus (A.D. 15-26) :—
 11. Ismael the son of Phabi (some time between 15 and 16 A.D.), *Antt.* xviii. 2. 2.⁵⁴⁸
 12. Eleasar the son of Ananos (some time between 16 and 17 A.D.), *Antt.* xviii. 2. 2.

⁵⁴⁶ Whether this *Joseph* should be included in the list is open to question, for he officiated only once, and that on the great day of atonement, merely as a substitute for *Matthias*, who had been prevented from doing duty himself in consequence of some Levitical defilement. But be this as it may, he was still, on this account, the actual high priest for at least a period of one day, while he is certainly included by Josephus, as otherwise the number would not have amounted to twenty-eight. His name likewise occurs in the list of Josephus the Christian (*Hypomnest.* chap. ii.). The singular incident just referred to is also frequently mentioned in the Rabbinical sources (see Selden, *De successione in pontificatum Ebr.* i. 11, ed. Francof. p. 160. Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, p. 160, note. Grätz, *Monatsschrift*, 1881, p. 51 ff.). The high priest now in question is there known as יוסף בן אילם.

⁵⁴⁷ In Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 13. 1, he is called 'Ιησοῦς ὁ Σεέ or Σεέ (the manuscripts reading sometimes the one and sometimes the other); Joseph. *Hypomnest.* 'Ιησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Σεέ; in Nicephorus, 'Ιησοῦς 'Ωσηέ; in Zonaras, *Annal.* vi. 2 (ed. Bonnens. i. 472), παῖς Σεέ.

⁵⁴⁸ The name of the father as given in Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 2, 2; Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* i. 10. 5, ed. Heinichen; and Zonaras, *Annal.* vi. 3 (ed. Bonnens. i. 477), is Φαβί; while in Euseb. *Demonstr. ev.* viii. 2. 100, it is Φήβα; in Joseph. *Hypomnest.* Βαβή; and in *Chron. pasch.*, ed. Dindorf, i. 417, Βαφεί.

13. Simon the son of Kamithos (somewhere about 17–18 A.D.), *Antt.* xviii. 2. 2.⁵⁴⁹

14. Joseph called Caiaphas (somewhere between 18 and 36 A.D.), *Antt.* xviii. 2. 2, 4. 3. Comp. *Matt.* xxvi. 3, 57; *Luke* iii. 2; *John* xi. 49, xviii. 13, 14, 24, 28; *Acts* iv. 6. According to *John* xviii. 13, he was the son-in-law of Hannas = Ananos.⁵⁵⁰

(e) Appointed by Vitellius (35–39 A.D.):—

15. Jonathan the son of Ananos (36–37 A.D.), *Antt.* xviii. 4. 3, 5. 3. Comp. *xix.* 6. 4. He was found still playing a prominent part in public life in the time of Cumanus, 50–52 A.D. (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 12. 5–6), and was ultimately assassinated at the instigation of Felix the procurator (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 13. 3; *Antt.* xx. 8. 5).

16. Theophilos the son of Ananos (37 ff. A.D.), *Antt.* xviii. 5. 3.

(f) Appointed by Agrippa I. (41–44 A.D.):—

17. Simon Kantheras the son of Boethos (41 ff. A.D.), *Antt.* xix. 6. 2.⁵⁵¹

18. Matthias the son of Ananos, *Antt.* xix. 6. 4.

19. Elionaios the son of Kantheros, *Antt.* xix. 8. 1.⁵⁵²

⁵⁴⁹ This high priest is also frequently mentioned in the Rabbinical sources (Selden, *De successione in pontificat.* pp. 161, 177, ed. Francof. Derenbourg, *Histoire*, p. 197. Grätz, *Monatsschrift* 1881, p. 53 ff.). He is there known by the name of שמעון בן קמחית. In *Joseph. Antt.*, Euseb. *Hist. eccl.*, and in Zonaras, *Annal.* vi. 3 (i. 477), the father's name is Κάμυθος, while in Euseb. *Demonstr.* it is Κάθμμος, in *Joseph. Hypomnest.* Κάθμμος, and in *Chron. pasch.*, ed. Dindorf, i. 408 and 417, Καμαθεί.

⁵⁵⁰ The surname Caiaphas is not = כִּיפָא, but = כִּיפָא or קִיפָא; see note 544 above. Derenbourg, p. 215, note 2.

⁵⁵¹ See the wild combinations of every sort that have been indulged in with regard to this personage in Grätz, *Monatsschrift* 1881, pp. 97–112.

⁵⁵² According to *Antt.* xx. 1. 3, he also appears to have the surname Kantheras as well as his father. In the Mishna, *Para* iii. 5, he is known as אֱלִיָּהוּ בֶן הַקִּיָּה (see note 544, above). The Rabbinical tradition regards him as a son of Caiaphas. The name אֱלִיָּהוּ (my eyes are directed to Jehovah) or אֱלִיָּהוּ is also to be met with in the Old Testament (*Ezra* viii. 4, x. 22, 27; 1 *Chron.* iii. 23, iv. 36, vii. 8, xxvi. 3).

(g) Appointed by Herod of Chalkis (44–48 A.D.).⁵⁵³

20. Joseph the son of Kami or Kamedes (= Kamithos),
Antt. xx. 1. 3, 5. 2.⁵⁵⁴

21. Ananias the son of Nedebaios (somewhere between 47 and 59 A.D.), *Antt.* xx. 5. 2; comp. xx. 6. 2; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 12. 6; Acts xxiii. 2, xxiv. 1. In consequence of his wealth he continued to be a man of great influence even after his deposition, although, at the same time, notorious for his avarice (*Antt.* xx. 9. 2–4). He was put to death by the insurgents at the commencement of the Jewish war (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 6, 9).⁵⁵⁵

(h) Appointed by Agrippa II. (50–100 A.D.):—

22. Ismael the son of Phabi (about 59–61 A.D.), *Antt.* xx. 8. 8, 11. He is probably identical with the person of the same name whose execution at Cyrene is incidentally mentioned, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 2.⁵⁵⁶

⁵⁵³ It would also be somewhere about this time (about 44 A.D.) that the high priest Ismael comes in, who according to *Antt.* iii. 15. 3, was in office during the great famine in the reign of the Emperor Claudius. But as Josephus says nothing about him in the course of the narrative itself, we are probably to look upon this casual mention of him as a fault of memory on the part of the historian. Ewald (*Geschichte*, vi. 634) inserts him after *Elionaios*, while Wieseler (*Chronologie des apostol. Zeitalters*, p. 159) identifies him with this latter.

⁵⁵⁴ The name of the father, which at one time appears as *Καμεί* (*Antt.* xx. 1. 3 = Zonaras, *Annal.* vi. 12, *fin.*) or *Κάμην* (Joseph. *Hypomnest.*), at another as *Καμεδής* (*Antt.* xx. 5. 2, according to the reading of Dindorf and Bekker = Zonaras, *Annal.* vi. 14), is in any case identical with Kamithos.

⁵⁵⁵ For his avarice, comp. besides the Talmudic tradition in Derenbourg's *Histoire*, p. 233 f.

⁵⁵⁶ It is probably this younger Ismael, son of Phabi (not the high priest of the same name who stands eleventh in the list), that is also referred to in the Rabbinical traditions regarding *ישמעאל בן פיאבי* (Mishna, *Para* iii. 5; *Sota* ix. 15; in the latter passage it is also the high priest of this name that is meant, for the predicate Rabbi should, with *Cod. de Rossi*, be expunged. Tosefta. ed. Zuckermann, pp. 182. 26, 533. 35 f., 632. 6. See in general, Derenbourg's *Histoire*, pp. 232–235). In the printed texts the father's name is frequently corrupted. The correct form is *פיאבי*, or divided thus *פי אבי* (as in *Cod. de Rossi* 138, in the one passage in which it occurs in

23. Joseph Kabi,⁵⁵⁷ son of Simon the high priest (61–62 A.D.), *Antt.* xx. 8. 11; comp. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 2.
24. Ananos the son of Ananos (62 A.D., for only three months), *Antt.* xx. 9. 1. He was one of those who played a leading part during the first period of the Jewish war, but was subsequently put to death by the populace, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 3, 22. 1–2, iv. from 3. 7 to 5. 2; *Vita*, 38, 39, 44, 60.⁵⁵⁸
25. Jesus the son of Damnaïos (about 62–63 A.D.), *Antt.* xx. 9. 1. and 4; comp. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 2.
26. Jesus the son of Gamaliel (about 63–65 A.D.), *Antt.* xx. 9. 4, 7. In the course of the Jewish war he is frequently mentioned along with Ananos, whose fate he also shared, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 9, 4. 3, 5. 2; *Vita*, 38, 41. According to Rabbinical tradition, his wife, Martha, was of the house of Boethos.⁵⁵⁹
27. Matthias the son of Theophilos (65 ff. A.D.), *Antt.* xx. 9. 7; comp. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 2.⁵⁶⁰

the Mishna, viz. *Para* iii. 5). There is as near an approach to this as possible in the Greek form Φιαβί, which is found in the manuscripts in one instance at least, viz. *Antt.* xx. 8. 8.

⁵⁵⁷ In Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 8. 11, the surname is written Καβί; in Zonaras, *Annal.* vi. 17, it is Δικαβί (i.e. δὲ Καβί); and in Joseph. *Hypomnest.* Κάμης. The latter would correspond to Kamithos.

⁵⁵⁸ For combinations with respect to this high priest, see Grätz, *Monatsschr.* 1881, pp. 56–62.

⁵⁵⁹ Mishna, *Jebamoth* vi. 4: "If one happens to be betrothed to a widow, and is subsequently appointed to the office of high priest, he is at liberty to conduct her home as his bride. Thus Josua, son of Gamla, was betrothed to Martha the daughter of Boethos, and afterwards the king appointed him to be high priest; and on the back of this he conducted Martha home as his bride." Our Josua, son of Gamala, is probably identical again with the Ben Gamala who, according to *Joma* iii. 9, ordered a golden urn to be made from which to draw the lots relating to the two he-goats on the great day of atonement. For further Rabbinical traditions regarding this personage, see Derenbourg, p. 248 f. As to his services in the way of promoting education, see below, § 27, note 29.

⁵⁶⁰ On this high priest, see also Grätz, *Monatsschr.* 1881, pp. 62–64.

- (*) Appointed by the people during the war (67-68 A.D.):—
 28. Phannias or Phineesos the son of Samuel, and of humble origin, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 8; *Antt.* xx. 10.⁵⁶¹

Owing to the frequency with which those high priests were changed, the number of those who had ceased to hold office was always something considerable. But, although they no longer discharged the active functions of the office, they still continued to occupy an important and influential position, as can still be shown with regard to several of them at least.⁵⁶² We know from the New Testament, for example, what an amount of influence the elder *Ananos* or Hannas (No. 10) had even as a retired high priest. The same may be said of his son Jonathan (No. 15), who, long after he had ceased to hold office, conducted an embassy, in the year 52 A.D., to the Syrian viceroy Umidius Quadratus. This latter then sent him to Rome to answer for certain disturbances that had taken place in Judaea; and when he had got the matter settled in favour of the Jews, he took the opportunity of his being in Rome to request the emperor to send Felix as the new procurator. Then when Felix was found to be causing universal dissatisfaction in consequence of the way in which he was discharging the functions of his office, Jonathan took the liberty of reminding him of his duty, for doing which however he had to answer with his life.⁵⁶³ Another high priest, *Ananias* the son of Nedebaïos (No. 21), ruled in Jerusalem almost like a despot after he had retired from office. Then the younger *Ananos* (No. 24) and Jesus the son of Gamaliel (No. 26), although no longer exercising the functions of the high-priesthood, were found at the head of affairs in the earlier stage of the Jewish war. From all this it is evident that, though not actually in office, those men were by no means condemned to

⁵⁶¹ This, the last of the high priests, is also known to the Rabbinical traditions; see Derenbourg, p. 269. His name in Hebrew was פִּינְחָס.

⁵⁶² For what follows, comp. *Stud. u. Krit.* 1872, p. 619 ff.

⁵⁶³ The references to passages are to be found above, *passim*.

political inactivity. On the contrary, the office was such that it imparted to the holder of it a *character indelibilis* in virtue of which he retained, even after demitting it, a large portion of the rights and obligations of the officiating high priest,⁵⁶⁴ and of course the title of ἀρχιερεύς as well, a title that, in Josephus, is accorded to the whole of the ex-high priests. Consequently wherever in the New Testament ἀρχιερεῖς appear at the head of the Sanhedrim, we are to understand that those referred to are first and foremost the ex-high priests in question, inclusive at the same time of the one actually in office.⁵⁶⁵

But sometimes we read of certain other personages who are described as ἀρχιερεῖς, and yet their names do not appear in the foregoing list. In the Acts (iv. 6) we have the following enumeration: "Αννας ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ Καϊάφας καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ ὅσοι ἦσαν ἐκ γένους ἀρχιερατικοῦ. In a subsequent passage (xix. 14) mention is made of a high priest called Sceva with his seven sons. Josephus again mentions a certain Jesus, son of Sapphias, as being τῶν ἀρχιερέων ἓνα,⁵⁶⁶ also one Simon ἐξ ἀρχιερέων, who was still young at the time of the war, and consequently cannot be identical with Simon

⁵⁶⁴ *Horajoth* iii. 1-4. See, in particular, iii. 4: "Between a high priest in office and one who has demitted it there is no more difference than between the young oxen on the great day of atonement and the tenth of an ephah. But both are equal to one another in respect of the service on the great day of atonement, in respect of the law requiring them to marry a maid; both alike are forbidden to marry a widow, to defile themselves by contact with the dead bodies of blood relations, to let the hair grow long, to rend their garments, while their death (in the event of their being murdered) has the effect of bringing back the murderer." The same points to some extent are also found in *Megilla* i. 9 and *Makkoth* ii. 6.

⁵⁶⁵ This is corroborated above all by the following passages, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 12. 6: τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς Ἰουάθην καὶ Ἀνανίαν; *Vita*, 38: τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς Ἀνανον καὶ Ἰησοῦν τὸν τοῦ Γαμαλᾶ; *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 7: ὁ γεραίτατος τῶν ἀρχιερέων Ἀνανος. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 4. 3: ὁ μετ' Ἀνανον γεραίτατος τῶν ἀρχιερέων Ἰησοῦς. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 9: οἱ δοκιμάτατοι τῶν ἀρχιερέων, Γαμαλᾶ μὲν υἱὸς Ἰησοῦς, Ἀνανὸν δὲ Ἀνανος. In the last three passages the ἀρχιερεῖς must have been high priests in the sense in which Ananos and Jesus were so, i.e. ex-high priests in the strict sense of the word.

⁵⁶⁶ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 4.

Kantheras (No. 17),⁵⁶⁷ and lastly, one Matthias, son of Boethos, τὸν ἀρχιερέα or ἐκ τῶν ἀρχιερέων.⁵⁶⁸ Not one of those just mentioned is to be found in our list. Besides there is many a high priest known to the Rabbinical traditions whose name does not appear there.⁵⁶⁹ This fact may perhaps be sufficiently accounted for by what we are now going to mention.

Apròpos of the irregular appointment of Phannias to the office of high priest, Josephus remarks,⁵⁷⁰ that the zealots, by acting as they did on this occasion, "had robbed of their importance those families from which in their order it had been the practice to select the high priests" (ἀκυρα τὰ γένη ποιήσαντες ἐξ ὧν κατὰ διαδοχὰς οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀπεδείκνυντο). *The high-priesthood would therefore seem to have been vested in a few privileged families.* The truth is, one only requires to glance at the foregoing list in order to be convinced that the office was confined to only a few families. To the family of Phabi, for example, belong Nos. 3, 11, 22; to the family of Boethos, Nos. 4, 7, 8, 17, 19, 26; to the family of Ananos (or Hannas), Nos. 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 24, 27; and to the family of Kamith, Nos. 13, 20, 23. Leaving Ananel, a Babylonian of humble origin (No. 1), Aristobulus the last of the Asmonaeans (No. 2), and Phannias, the high priest of the revolution period (No. 28), out of account, there remain only five (Nos. 5, 6, 9, 21, 25) who cannot be proved to have belonged to one or other of those families, although it is still possible that they did so. Now when one considers how the high-priesthood was thus confined to a few families, and in what high estimation the office was held, it is not difficult to see that the mere fact of belonging to any one of the privileged families in question must of itself have been sufficient to confer special distinction upon a man. And hence we can understand how it should be that Josephus, in a certain passage in which he wishes to tell us particularly who of the notabilities were among those who went over to

⁵⁶⁷ *Vita*, 39.⁵⁶⁸ *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 11, v. 13. 1, vi. 2. 2.⁵⁶⁹ See *Stud. u. Krit.* 1872, p. 639.⁵⁷⁰ *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 6.

the Romans, enumerates the *υἱοὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων* along with the *ἀρχιερεῖς* themselves.⁵⁷¹ In the Mishna again, we find that on one occasion the “sons of the high priests” (*בְּנֵי כֹהֲנִים*) are quoted as authorities on certain points of matrimonial law, and that too without mentioning their names, seeing that the simple fact of their being high priests’ sons stamped them as men of importance and authority.⁵⁷² In another instance, we are informed that letters with unusually large seals had come “to the sons of the high priests” (*לְבְנֵי כֹהֲנִים*) from distant lands,⁵⁷³ from which we may again infer that these also enjoyed a certain reputation abroad. But they did not rest satisfied with the mere dignity of rank; so far from that, the members of those high-priestly families also played a prominent part in public affairs. According to Acts iv. 6, among those who had seats and a right to speak and vote in the Sanhedrim were *οἱ ἦσαν ἐκ γένους ἀρχιερατικοῦ*, where, from all that has been already stated, it is certain that the *γένος ἀρχιερατικόν* can only refer to the privileged families now in question. Now, if the members of the high-priestly families occupied so distinguished a position, it is quite conceivable that the designation *ἀρχιερεῖς* would come to be used in a more comprehensive sense so as to include them as well. That this is what actually took place may be seen, to say nothing of all that has been previously advanced, from the passage in Josephus mentioned above, where after recording the fact that two high priests and eight high priests’ sons were among those who went over to the Romans, he proceeds to include these two categories under the common designation of *ἀρχιερεῖς*.⁵⁷⁴ This will also serve to account for the circumstance of high priests being sometimes mentioned that are not to be found in our list.

⁵⁷¹ *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 2.⁵⁷² *Kethuboth* xiii. 1–2.⁵⁷³ *Ohaloth* xvii. 5.

⁵⁷⁴ *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 2: “Ὁν ἦσαν ἀρχιερεῖς μὲν Ἰώσηπος τε καὶ Ἰησοῦς, υἱοὶ δ’ ἀρχιερέων τρεῖς μὲν Ἰσμαήλου τοῦ κατατομηθέντος ἐν Κυρήνῃ, καὶ τοῦ Ματθίου τέσσαρες, καὶ εἷς ἑτέρου Ματθίου παῖς, διαδράς μετὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπώλειαν, ὃν ὁ τοῦ Γιώρα Σίμων ἀπέκτεινε σὺν τριπλῇ υἱοῖς, ὡς προεῖρηται. Πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων εὐγενῶν τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι συμμετεβάλλοντο.

Consequently the high priests that, in the New Testament as well as in Josephus,⁵⁷⁵ appear as leading personages would consist, in the first instance, of the high priests properly so called, *i.e.* the one actually in office and those who had previously been so, and then, of the members of those privileged families from which the high priests were taken. In the days of Roman rule they were at the head of the Sanhedrim and of the native government generally, and although the majority of them were unquestionably men of Sadducean tendencies, yet in the actual conduct of affairs they bowed, however reluctantly, to the wishes of the Pharisees (see above, p. 154).

⁵⁷⁵ Especially in the section, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14-17

§ 24. THE PRIESTHOOD AND THE TEMPLE WORSHIP

THE LITERATURE.

- Lightfoot, *Ministerium templi quale erat tempore nostri servatoris* (Opp. ed. Rotterdam, i. pp. 671-758).
- Lundius, *Die alten jüdischen Heilighümer, Gottesdienste und Gewohnheiten, für Augen gestellet in einer ausführlichen Beschreibung des gantzen levitischen Priesterthums, etc., itzo von neuem übersehen und in beygefügten Anmerckungen hin und wieder theils verbessert, theils vermehret durch Johan. Christophorum Wolfium*, Hamburg 1738.
- Carpzov (Joh. Gottlob), *Apparatus historico criticus antiquitatum sacri codicis* (1748), pp. 64-118, 611 ff., 699 ff.
- Ugolini, *Sacerdotium Hebraicum*, in his *Thesaurus Antiquitatum sacrarum*, vol. xiii. *Ibid.*, still other cognate monographs in vols. xii. and xiii.
- Bähr, *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus*, 2 vols. 1837-1839), vol. i. 2nd ed. 1874.
- Winer, *Realwörterb.*, arts. "Priester," "Levitens," "Abgaben," "Erstgeburt," "Erstlinge," "Hebe," "Zehnt," "Opfer," etc.
- Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, i. 387-424, iii. 106 ff., 162 ff.
- Oehler, art. "Priesterthum," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. xii. 174-187. *Ibid.* by the same, arts. "Levi," vol. viii. 347-358; "Nethinim," vol. x. 296 f.; and "Opfercultus," vol. x. 614-652. The same articles in the second edition as revised by Orelli.
- De Wette, *Lehrbuch der hebräisch-jüdischen Archäol.* (4th ed. 1864), p. 268 ff.
- Ewald, *Die Alterthümer des Volkes Israel*, Göttingen 1866.
- Keil, *Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie* (2nd ed. 1875), pp. 166 ff., 200 ff., 357 ff., 373 ff.
- Haneberg, *Die religiösen Alterthümer der Bibel* (2nd ed. 1869), pp. 356 ff., 508 ff., 599 ff.
- Schenkel's *Bibellexicon*, the same articles as in Winer.
- Riehm, *Handwörterbuch des biblischen Alterthums*, the articles relating to our subject.
- Graf, *Zur Geschichte des Stammes Levi* (Merx' *Archiv für wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. T.'s*, vol. i. 1869, pp. 68-106, 208-236).
- Köhler, *Lehrbuch der biblischen Geschichte*, vol. i. 1875, pp. 363-454.
- Wellhausen, *Geschichte Israels*, vol. i. 1878, pp. 15-174 (2nd ed., under the title: *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 1883).
- Dillmann, *Exegetisches Handbuch zu Exodus und Leviticus* (1880), pp. 455-461 and elsewhere.
- Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), sec. ccxciv.

I. THE PRIESTHOOD AS A DISTINCT ORDER.

THE internal development of Israel subsequent to the exile

was essentially determined by the direction given to it by two equally influential classes, viz. the *priests* on the one hand and the *scribes* on the other. During the centuries immediately following the exile and till far on into the Greek era, it was, in the first instance, the influence of the *priests* that was predominant. It was they who had been instrumental in organizing the new community; it was from them that the law had emanated; and to their hands had been entrusted the direction, not only of the material, but also of the spiritual affairs of the whole body of the people. But although originally it was they who were specially versed in the law and were looked upon as its authoritative interpreters, yet by and by there gradually grew up alongside of them an independent order of doctors or men learned in the law. And the importance and influence of these latter would necessarily go on increasing in proportion as the priests grew less and less zealous for the law of their fathers on the one hand, and as the law itself came to acquire a greater value and significance in the estimation of the people on the other. This was the case more particularly after the Maccabaeian wars of independence. Ever since then the *scribes* got the spiritual superintendence of the people more and more into their own hands. And so the *age of the priests* was succeeded by that of the *scribes* (comp. Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften A. T.'s*). This however is not to be understood as implying that the priests had now lost all their influence. Politically and socially they still occupied the foremost place quite as much as ever they did. It is true the scribes had now come to be recognised as the teachers of the people. But, in virtue of their political standing, in virtue of the powerful resources at their command, and, lastly and above all, in virtue of their sacred prerogatives—for, inasmuch as they enjoyed the exclusive right of offering Israel's sacrifices to God, their intervention was necessary to the fulfilment of his religious duties in the case of every member of the community,—in virtue of all this, we say, the priests still

continued to have an extraordinary significance for the life of the nation.

Now this significance of theirs was due mainly to the simple fact that they constituted a distinct order, possessing the exclusive right to offer the people's sacrifices to God. According to the legislation of the Pentateuch, which had been regarded as absolutely binding ever since the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, "*the sons of Aaron*" were alone entitled to take part in the sacrificial worship.¹ The priesthood was therefore a fraternity fenced round with irremovable barriers, for they had been fixed for ever by natural descent. No one could possibly be admitted to this order who did not belong to it by birth; nor could any one be excluded from it whose legitimate birth entitled him to admission. Now this order, so rigidly exclusive in its character, was in possession of the highest privilege that can well be conceived of, the privilege namely of offering to God all the sacrifices of the nation at large, and of every individual member of the community. This circumstance alone could not but be calculated to invest the priesthood with a vast amount of influence and authority, all the more that civil life was intertwined, in such an endless variety of ways, with the religious observances.² But, in addition to this, there was the fact, that ever since the Deuteronomic legislation came into force in the time of Josiah

¹ See in particular, Ex. xxviii.-xxix.; Lev. viii.-x.; Num. xvi.-xviii. I should observe here that the following view is based on the assumption that the so-called priestly code, *i.e.* the bulk of the laws in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, belongs to a later date than Deuteronomy and Ezekiel. This, as it appears to me, has been clearly demonstrated by the more recent criticism of the Pentateuch. The legislation of the priestly code evidently represents, in all its leading features, a later stage of development than Deuteronomy and Ezekiel. The two latter books would be simply unintelligible were we to suppose that their authors wrote them with the priestly code already lying before them.

² There were, for example, numerous points in matrimonial law and medical jurisprudence that could only be settled by having recourse to the priests; see Num. v. 11-31 (the procedure in the case of the woman suspected of adultery); Lev. xiii., xiv.; Deut. xxiv. 8, 9 (procedure in the case of leprosy).

(about 630 B.C.), it was declared to be unlawful to offer sacrifices anywhere but in Jerusalem, *the whole worship being concentrated in its sole and only legitimate sanctuary*. Consequently all the various offerings from every quarter of the land flowed into Jerusalem and met at this one common centre of worship, the result being that the priests that officiated within it came to acquire great power and wealth. Moreover, this centralization of the worship had the additional effect of uniting all the members of the priesthood into one firmly compacted body.

From what has just been said it follows, as matter of course, that *the primary requisite in a priest was evidence of his pedigree*. On this the greatest possible stress was laid. The person who failed to produce it could claim no title whatever to the rights and privileges of the priesthood. Even so far back as the time when the first of the exiles returned under Zerubbabel, certain priestly families were debarred from the sacred office because they could not produce their genealogical registers.^{3a} On the other hand, Josephus assures us, with regard to his own case, that he found his pedigree recorded "in the public archives."^{3b} Consequently the family registers would appear to have had the character of public records on account of their importance for the community at large.

With the view of keeping the blood of the priestly stock as pure as possible, there were also certain regulations prescribed with regard to *marriage*. According to the law given in Lev. xxi. 7, 8, a priest was forbidden to marry a prostitute, or a deflowered maid, or a woman put away from her husband; consequently he could only choose an undefiled virgin or widow, and of course even then only such as were of Israelitish origin.⁴ At the same time there was no caste-like restriction

^{3a} Ezra ii. 61-63=Neh. vii. 63-65.

^{3b} Joseph. *Vita*, 1: τὴν μὲν οὖν τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν διαδοχὴν, ὡς ἐν ταῖς δημοσίαις δέλτοις ἀναγεγραμμένην εὔρον, οὕτω παρατίθεται.

⁴ Joseph. *contra Apion*. i. 7: δεῖ γὰρ τὸν μετέχοντα τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἐξ ἰσραηλινῶν καὶ ἀκατήρατος πατρὸς καὶ μητρὸς εἶναι.

forbidding them to marry any but the daughters of priests. Nor were these regulations in any way relaxed in later times, for so far from that they came to be but the more sharply defined.⁵ We find, for example, that a chaluza, *i.e.* a widow whom her brother-in-law declined to marry (according to the law regarding levirate marriage), was also to be treated as one "who had been put away from her husband."⁶ Again a priest was forbidden to marry a woman who had been taken captive in war as being a person that might well be suspected of having been violated.⁷ Then, if a priest was already without children, he was forbidden, in marrying again, to marry a woman who was "incapable;"⁸ but, in any case, he was never to choose a female proselyte or emancipated slave; nor the daughter of a man who had been formerly a slave, except in those cases in which the mother happened to be of Israelitish extraction.⁹ The regulations were still more stringent in the case of the *high priest*. He was not allowed to marry even a widow, but only an undefiled virgin (Lev. xxi. 13-15). This, like the former regulations, was also enforced and rendered yet more precise in later times.¹⁰ In

⁵ See in general, Philo, *De monarchia*, lib. ii. sec. viii.-xi. (ed. Mang. ii. 228 f.). Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 12. 2. The Rabbinical prescriptions as given in Selden, *De successione in pontificatum*, ii. 2, 3; Ibid. *Uxor Ebraica*, i. 7. Wagenseil's note to *Sota* iv. 1 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, iii. 230 ff.). Ugolini, *Thesaurus*, vol. xiii. col. 911 ff.

⁶ *Sota* iv. 1, viii. 3; *Makkoth* iii. 1. Targum of Jonathan, Sifra and Pesikta to Lev. xxi. 7, as given in Ugolini, *ut supra*.

⁷ Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 12. 2; *contra Apion.* i. 7; *Antt.* xiii. 10. 5, *fin.* (account of John Hyrcanus). According to *Kethuboth* ii. 9, even priests' wives that had been found in a town captured by the enemy were debarred from any further conjugal intercourse with their husbands, unless it could be shown by satisfactory evidence that they had not been violated.

⁸ *Jebamoth* vi. 5.

⁹ Never a female proselyte or emancipated slave, *Jebamoth* vi. 5. With regard to the daughters, see *Bikkurim* i. 5. Rabbi Elieser ben Jakob says: "A priest is never to marry the daughter of a proselyte except when her mother happens to be of Israel." This is no less applicable to the daughters of emancipated slaves. Even in the tenth generation it is lawful only where the mother is of Israelitish origin.

¹⁰ Philo, *De monarchia*, ii. 9. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 12. 2. *Jebamoth* vi. 4: "A high priest must not marry a widow, whether she has become such subse-

affirming, as he does, that the high priest could only marry a virgin belonging to a priestly family,¹¹ Philo states what is at variance at once with the text of Leviticus and the later standpoint of the law, from both of which it is evident that it was permissible for the high priest to marry any Israelitish virgin, no matter to what family she might belong. Possibly Philo's view may have been suggested to him by the terms of the passage in Leviticus as it stands in the Septuagint,¹² perhaps also by actual practice, or, it may be, by both combined. The regulation in Ezekiel (xliv. 22), to the effect that a priest was only to marry a virgin, or the widow of a priest, found no place in the law as subsequently developed. Considering the great importance that was attached to the strict observance of those regulations, a priest on the occasion of his marriage was, of course, required to furnish precise evidence of his wife's pedigree. Josephus has described at length the very careful way in which this was gone about,¹³ while in the

quent to her betrothal or subsequent to her actual marriage. Nor is he at liberty to choose as a wife a woman already perfectly marriageable. Rabbi Elieser and Rabbi Simon regard a marriageable woman as allowable. Nor is he to marry one that has been injured by an accident." According to Philo, *De monarchia*, ii. 9, *fin.*, the high priest was on no account to marry one that had been previously betrothed. Comp. Ritter's *Philo und die Halacha* (1879), p. 72. Lundius, *Die alten jüdischen Heiligthümer*, book iii. chap. xix.

¹¹ Philo, *De monarchia*, ii. 11: προστάξας τῷ μὲν ἀρχιερεὶ μὴ μόνον μόνον γυναῖκα παρθένον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἱερεῖαν ἐξ ἱερέων.

¹² In the Septuagint, Lev. xxi. 13 runs thus: οὗτος γυναῖκα παρθένον ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ λήψεται, there being nothing in the Hebrew text corresponding to the words ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ. Comp. Ritter's *Philo und die Halacha*, p. 72 f.

¹³ *Apion*. i. 7. From what is there said one must necessarily assume that surely there were a great many families that were in possession of genealogical registers. Comp. in addition, the copious lists in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah; and further, the indications of the existence of such registers to be met with in the New Testament, Matt. i. 1 f.; Luke ii. 36, iii. 23 ff.; Acts xiii. 21; Rom. xi. 1; Phil. iii. 5. Also Mishna, *Jebamoth* iv. 13; *Taanith* iv. 5. Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* i. 7=Jul. African. *Epist. ad Aristidem* (in Routh's *Reliquiae sacrae*, ii. 228 ff., and Spitta, *Der Brief des Julius Africanus an Aristides*, 1877). Winer's *Realwörterb.* ii. 516-518; Herzfeld's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, i. 378-387 Wieseler's *Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien* (1869), p. 133 ff. Holtzmann in

Mishna it is prescribed how far back the evidence is to extend,¹⁴ and in what cases it may be dispensed with.¹⁵

Those regulations with regard to marriage are undoubtedly based upon the idea that the *priesthood is a sacred order*. The same idea has been further embodied in yet other prescriptions. According to the law (Num. xix.), every one was defiled who came in contact with a dead body, nay who even entered a house in which such body happened to be lying; but as for the priests, they were forbidden to approach a corpse or to take part in the funeral obsequies, the prohibition being absolute in the case of the high priest, while in the case of the ordinary priests, the only exception was in favour of very near blood relations: parents, children, and brothers or sisters (Lev. xxi. 1-4, 11-12; Ezek. xliv. 25-27). It would seem that the priest was not even at liberty to mourn for his own wife. Or are we to understand, although it is not expressly stated, that she is intended, as matter of course, to be included among the exceptions?¹⁶ In

Schenkel's *Bibellex.* ii. 425-430. Hamburger's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd part, art. "Genealogie."

¹⁴ *Kiddushin* iv. 4: "When a priest wants to marry *the daughter of a priest*, he must go back and find evidence with regard to four generations of mothers, and therefore, strictly speaking, with regard to eight mothers. These are, her own mother and her mother's mother; the mother of her maternal grandfather and her mother again; the mother of her father and her mother; the mother of her paternal grandfather and her mother again. If, on the other hand, the woman he wants to marry be simply *a daughter of Levi or of Israel*, he must go back a step farther."

¹⁵ *Kiddushin* iv. 5: "It is unnecessary to search back in the case of a priest who has ministered at the altar, or of a Levite who has sung in the choir, or of a member of the Sanhedrim. As a rule, all those whose ancestors are well known to have been public officials or almoners, are at liberty to marry one belonging to a priestly family without further inquiry."

¹⁶ According to the usual interpretation of the text of Lev. xxi. 4 as we now have it, the mourning of the priest for his wife would seem to be even expressly forbidden. Although, in this instance, both exposition and text are exceedingly doubtful (see Dillmann's note on the passage), still the fact remains that the wife is not mentioned as one of the exceptions. Nor is she mentioned as such either by Philo, *De monarchia*, ii. 12, or by Josephus, *Antt.* iii. 12. 2. The Rabbinical writers, on the other hand, regard the

no case whatever was a priest to indulge in any token of grief calculated to disfigure the person, such as shaving the head or lacerating the body (Lev. xxi. 5, 6; comp. Ezek. xliv. 20), nor was the high priest to uncover his head and rend his garments (Lev. xxi. 10; comp. x. 6, 7).^{16a}

Then again it was essential to the sacred character attaching to a priest, that he should be *totally free from every sort of physical defect*. If any one had a bodily defect of any kind about him, no matter though he belonged to the "sons of Aaron," he was thereby disqualified from officiating as a priest. The various kinds of defects are already enumerated with pretty considerable detail in the law as found in Leviticus (xxi. 16–23). And, as was to be expected, this too is one of those points on which a later age has exercised its ingenuity in the way of being minutely and painfully specific. It has been calculated that the number of bodily defects that disqualified a man for the office of the priesthood amount in all to 142.¹⁷ At the same time however the priests who, for the reason now in question, were debarred from exercising any of the functions of the priesthood, were entitled to a share of the emoluments as well as the others, for they too belonged to the *ordo*.¹⁸

There is nothing prescribed in the law as to the *age* at which a priest was to be allowed to enter upon the duties of his office. Perhaps we may venture to assume that it must

שָׂרָא of Lev. xxi. 2 as referring to her, while they understand xxi. 4 of the act of mourning for an illegitimate wife. See the passages from the Targum of Jonathan and Sifra in Ugolini, xiii. 929 ff. For the subject generally, consult besides, Oehler, xii. 176 f.

^{16a} Comp. besides, Lundius, *Die alten jüdischen Heiligtümer*, book iii. chap. 20.

¹⁷ Haneberg, *Die religiösen Alterthümer der Bibel*, p. 532. See in general, Philo, *De monarchia*, ii. 5. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 12. 2. Mishna, *Bechoroth* vii. Selden, *De successione in pontificatum* Ebr. ii. 5. Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, pp. 89–94. Ugolini, xiii. 897 ff. Haneberg, p. 531 f. Oehler, xii. 176. For parallels from heathen antiquity, see the Knobel-Dillmann *Exeget. Handb. zu Exodus und Leviticus*, p. 568.

¹⁸ Lev. xxi. 22. Philo, *De monarchia*, ii. 13. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 12. 2; *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 7. Mishna, *Sebachim* xii. 1; *Menachoth* xiii. 10, *fin.*

have been the same as that at which the Levites entered upon theirs. Yet even this latter is given differently in different parts of the Old Testament.¹⁹ The Rabbinical tradition states that a priest was duly qualified for his duties as soon as the first signs of manhood made their appearance, but that he was not actually installed till he was twenty years of age.²⁰

And now when all the requirements to which we have referred were found to be satisfied, and when his fitness had been duly established to the satisfaction of the Sanhedrim,²¹ the priest was set apart to his office by a special *act of consecration*. According to the leading passage in the law bearing on this matter, viz. Ex. xxix. = Lev. viii., this solemn act consisted of three parts: (1) the washing of the body with water, (2) the putting on of the sacred vestments, and (3) a series of sacrifices the offering of which was accompanied with further ceremonies of a partly special kind, viz. the anointing of various parts of the body with blood, the sprinkling of the person and the garments with oil and blood, the "filling of the hands," *i.e.* the taking of certain portions of the victims and laying them upon the hands of the priest with the view of indicating thereby his future duties and rights. In several other passages (Ex. xxviii. 41, xxx. 30, xl. 12-15; Lev. vii. 36, x. 7; Num. iii. 3) there is superadded to these the pouring of ointment upon the head, an act which, according to the leading passage on the subject, was observed, and that as a mark of distinction, solely in the case of the high priest.²² The whole ceremony extended over *seven days* (Ex. xxix. 35 ff.; Lev. viii. 33 ff.). How it fared with this ceremony at a later period has been, so far as several of its details are

¹⁹ In Num. iv. 3, 23, 30, 35, 39, 43, 47, 1 Chron. xxiii. 3, it is stated to be the thirtieth, in Num. viii. 23-26 the twenty-fifth, and in Ezra iii. 8, 1 Chron. xxiii. 24, 27, 2 Chron. xxxi. 17, the twentieth year.

²⁰ See the passage from Sifra (= *Bab. Chullin* 24b) in Selden, *De successione*, ii. 4, and Ugolini, *Thes.* xiii. 927.

²¹ *Middoth* v. *fin.*

²² On this point, see Wellhausen, *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1877, p. 412 f. Dillmann's *Exeget. Handbuch*, note on Lev. viii. 12.

concerned, a matter of some dispute.²³ It is probable that the pouring of oil upon the head continued to be retained as a mark of distinction in the case of the high priest.²⁴

As the priests were so numerous it was simply impossible that they could all officiate at the same time. It was therefore necessary to have an arrangement according to which they could do so in regular rotation. With a view to this the whole body of the priests was divided into twenty-four families or courses of service.²⁵ The account of the origin and organization of those twenty-four courses of service as given by the Rabbinical tradition is as follows:²⁶ "Four courses of service (מִשְׁמֶרֶת) came back from the exile, viz.: Jedaiah,

²³ See in general, Selden, *De successione*, ii. 8, 9. Ugolini, *Thesaurus*, xiii. pp. 434 ff., 476-548. Bähr, *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus*, ii. 165 ff. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Priesterweihe." Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, vol. xiii. pp. 178-180. Haneberg, pp. 526-531. According to some, the newly admitted priest was only required to offer the meat-offering prescribed in Lev. vi. 12 ff. But this is utterly incredible, and is based upon a pure misapprehension of the Rabbinical passages, which undoubtedly require that the newly admitted (therefore newly consecrated) priest should, in the first instance, offer this sacrifice for himself before offering any other. See the passages in Ugolini, xiii. 546 f., and comp., in addition, Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese*, etc. (1851) p. 143. No further light is thrown upon the matter by Philo, *Vita Mosis*, iii. 16-18, and Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 8. 6, as they simply reproduce Ex. xxix.=Lev. viii.

²⁴ Comp. Wellhausen, *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1877, p. 412. But it would appear that, in the latter days of the temple, the high priest himself was no longer (or not always?) anointed, for the Mishna knows of other high priests, who in contradistinction to the anointed ones had been introduced to their office through the ceremony of investing with the sacred garments. See in particular, *Horajoth* iii. 4. But be this as it may, there is at all events no truth in the view of Maimonides, that the anointing had been discontinued ever since the exile.

²⁵ On this see Lightfoot, *Ministerium templi*, chap. vi. (*Opp.* i. pp. 691-694). Idem, *Harmonia evangelistarum*, note on Luke i. 5 (*Opp.* i. 258 ff.). Idem, *Horae hebraicae*, note on Luke i. 5 (*Opp.* ii. 486 ff.). Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, pp. 100-102. Ugolini, *Thesaurus*, vol. xiii. col. 872 ff. Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, i. p. 387 ff. Bertheau, *Exegetisches Handbuch zu Ezra, Nehemia und Ester* (1862), pp. 228-230. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. xii. pp. 182-186. Haneberg, *Die religiösen Alterthümer der Bibel*, p. 555 ff. Graf in *Merx' Archiv*, i. p. 225 f.

²⁶ *Jer. Taanith* iv. fol. 68, and as being substantially to the same effect,

Harim, Pashur, and Immer. . . . Then the prophets that were among them arose and made twenty-four lots and put them into an urn. And Jedaiah came and drew five lots, which, including himself, would therefore make six. And Harim came and drew five lots, which, including himself, would therefore make six. And Pashur came and drew five lots, which, including himself, would therefore make six. And Immer came and drew five lots, which, including himself, would therefore make six. . . . And heads of the courses of service (רָאִשֵׁי מִשְׁמֶרוֹת) were appointed. And the courses were divided into houses (בְּתֵי אָבוֹת). And there were courses consisting of five, six, seven, eight, or nine houses. In a course consisting of *five* houses, three of them had to serve one day each, while the remaining two had to serve two days each; in a course consisting of *six* houses, five of them had to serve one day each, while one had to serve two days; where it consisted of *seven*, each served one day; of *eight*, six served one day each and two served simultaneously the remaining day; of *nine*, five served one day each and four served simultaneously during two days." It is true that what is here stated regarding the origin (or, according to the Talmud, the restoration) of the twenty-four courses of service cannot be said to possess the value of an independent tradition, that, on the contrary, it is based merely upon inferences from certain facts that are mentioned elsewhere. Yet it has so far hit the mark as substantially to represent the actual state of the case. For there returned from the exile, along with Zerubbabel and Joshua, *four* families of priests, viz.: the children of Jedaiah, Immer, Pashur, and Harim, numbering in all 4289 (Ezra ii. 36–39 = Neh. vii. 39–42).^{26a} Further, that

Tosefta, *Taanith* ii. (both passages in Hebrew and Latin being given in Ugolini, vol. xiii. p. 876 ff.); partly also *Bab. Arachin* 12^b, comp. Herzfeld, i. 393. In the above quotation I follow the text of *Jer. Taanith*, only with a few abridgments here and there.

^{26a} The accuracy of the alleged numbers, so far as the time of Zerubbabel is concerned, has been questioned by Stade (*Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1884, 218, in the notice by Smend, *Die Listen der Bücher Esra und Nehemia*,

these four families comprised the whole body of the priesthood at the time of Ezra's arrival, and therefore some eighty years afterwards as well, is evident from Ezra x. 18–22. But, along with these mention is also made, as early as the time of Zerubbabel and Joshua (Neh. xii. 1–7), of twenty-two classes of priests, with a corresponding number of "heads" (ראשי הכהנים). And those same classes or divisions are also further met with in the time of Joshua's successor, Joiakim the high priest (Neh. xii. 12–21).²⁷ It is evident therefore that the four families were subdivided into twenty-two classes. Then it is substantially the same arrangement that is still to be met with in the time of Ezra. When this latter arrived with a fresh band of exiles, he brought along with him two more priestly families (Ezra viii. 2)²⁸ and added them to the four that were already in the country (Ezra x. 18–22). But we find that shortly after, the number of classes was once more almost the same as it had been in Zerubbabel's time, namely twenty-one, as may be seen from the list given in Neh. x. 3–9. However, only fourteen of the names mentioned in this latter passage are to be found in the two earlier lists (Neh. xii. 1–7, 12–21), all the rest being different. Consequently the organization of the divisions must, in the meanwhile, have undergone certain alterations of one kind or another, as would no doubt be deemed necessary on account of a fresh accession

1881). Besides the objections advanced by this writer, there is the further fact that, according to pseudo-Hecataeus, who belongs to the commencement of the Hellenistic period, the number of Jewish priests amounted in all to only 1500 (Joseph. *contra Apion.* i. 22, ed. Bekker, p. 202: καίτοι οἱ πάντες ἱερεῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, οἱ τὴν δεκάτην τῶν γινομένων λαμβάνοντες καὶ τὰ κοινὰ διοικοῦντες, περὶ χιλίους μάλιστα καὶ πεντακοσίους εἰσίν). May it not be that the women and children are to be understood as included in the above 4289? So far as our purpose is concerned this question may here be left an open one.

²⁷ In the second list only *one* of the names belonging to the first (Chattusch) is wanting. The remaining twenty-one names are all identically the same in both, as is clearly evident notwithstanding the numerous inaccuracies of the text. Comp. Bertheau's note on Neh. xii. 12.

²⁸ For the names Gershom and Daniel mentioned in this passage are the names of priestly families; see Bertheau's note on it.

of priestly families having been brought by Ezra, and for other reasons besides. However, under the new order of things the number of divisions remained the same as before and so continued, substantially at least, on through succeeding ages. In the time of the author of Chronicles, who traces back the arrangement that existed in his day to the time of David, the number of the divisions amounted to twenty-four (1 Chron. xxiv. 7-18). It is true that, in the catalogue of names furnished by this writer, scarcely more than a third of those in the earlier lists are to be found. That being so, we are bound to assume that, in the meanwhile, important changes must have taken place, always supposing that our author has not drawn somewhat upon his own imagination for a number of the names attributed to the time of David. Be that as it may, it is certain that, *from that point onwards, the division into twenty-four classes continued to subsist without any alteration whatever.* For we learn on the express testimony of Josephus, that it was still maintained in his own day,²⁹ to say nothing of the fact that some of the names of the division continued to be occasionally mentioned (Joiarib, 1 Macc. ii. 1; Abia, Luke i. 5).³⁰ It is somewhat strange that, in a passage in his *contra Apionem*,—a passage, however, that has come down to us only in a Latin version,—Josephus should be found speaking of *four* families or divisions (*tribus*) of the priests.³¹ One might perhaps be disposed to think that here

²⁹ *Antt.* vii. 14. 7: διέμεινεν οὗτος ὁ μερισμὸς ἄχρι τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας. *Vita*, 1: ἐμοὶ δ' οὐ μόνον ἐξ ἱερέων ἐστὶ τὸ γένος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ τῆς πρώτης ἐφημερίδος τῶν εἰκοσιτεσσάρων (πολλὴ δὲ καὶν τούτῳ διαφορὰ), καὶ τῶν ἐν ταύτῃ φυλῶν ἐκ τῆς ἀρίστης. Comp. besides, *Taanith* iv. 2; *Sukka* v. 6-8, and the commentaries thereon.

³⁰ *Joiarib* and *Jedaiah* are also mentioned, *Baba kamma* ix. 12. The division *Joiarib* is the one that is said to have been officiating when the temple was destroyed, *Bab. Taanith* 29^a, in Derenbourg's *Histoire de la Palestine*, p. 291. The division or course of *Bilga* is mentioned in *Sukka* v. 8.

³¹ *Contra Apion.* ii. 8 (ed. Bekker, pp. 239, 20 ff.): Licet enim sint *tribus* quattuor sacerdotum, et harum tribuum singulae habeant hominum plus quam quinque milia, fit tamen observatio particulariter per dies certos; et his transactis alii succedentes ad sacrificia veniunt, etc.

the historian had in view the *four* families that returned with Zerubbabel. But as the context shows that he is clearly referring to the courses of service, there is nothing for it but to assume that the text has been corrupted, and that for four we ought to substitute twenty-four. Nor can it be said that this view is at once disposed of by the circumstance that Josephus alleges that the number in each division amounted to over 5000 souls. For it is probable that this number included the Levites (who were also divided into twenty-four divisions, every division of the priests having its corresponding division of Levites), and perhaps women and children as well; besides, we know only too well that one cannot depend a great deal on Josephus in the matter of numbers.

Each of the twenty-four main divisions was in turn broken up into a number of *sub-divisions*. If we may trust the Talmudic tradition quoted above (p. 182), the number of those sub-divisions ranged from five to nine for each main division. The main divisions were known either under the general designation of מַחְלָקוֹת (divisions, so 1 Chron. xxviii. 13, 21; 2 Chron. viii. 14, xxiii. 8, xxxi. 2, 15, 16), or, in so far as they were made up of the members of one family, they were called בֵּית אָבוֹת (houses of their fathers, so 1 Chron. xxiv. 4, 6), or, in so far as they had the services of the temple to attend to, they were described as מִשְׁמְרוֹת (watches, so Neh. xiii. 30; 2 Chron. xxxi. 16). As regards the sub-divisions, for our knowledge of which we are indebted solely to the testimony of post-Biblical literature, they are known by the designation of בְּתֵי אָבוֹת. And so now it had become the regular practice to distinguish the two by calling the *main division* a מִשְׁמֶרֶת and the *sub-division* a בֵּית אָב.³² At the same time this distinction is not necessarily involved in the signification of the words

³² This distinction is specially noticeable in *Taanith* ii. 6, 7. Comp. further the passage quoted above, p. 182; also *Jer. Horajoth* iii. fol. 48^b; and *Tosefta, Horajoth, fin.*, where it is stated that a ראש משמר is higher in point of rank than a ראש בית אב. Again, משמר is also met with in *Sukka* v. 6-8, *Taanith* iv. 2, and *Tamid* v. 1, undoubtedly in the sense of "main division," or "division for a week's service." But it is also to be similarly

themselves. For as *משמר* may mean any division for service, so *בית אב*, on the other hand, may mean any body composed of the members of the same family, no matter whether they consist of few persons or of many.³³ Accordingly, as we have just remarked, the author of the Book of Chronicles is still found to be making use of *בית אבות* (in Neh. xii. 12 shortened into *אבות*) as one of his expressions for denoting the main divisions or courses. But it would appear that somewhat later the distinction referred to above came to be rigidly observed. In Greek the term for one of the main divisions is *πατριά* or *ἐφημερία* or *ἐφημερίς*, and for one of the sub-divisions *φυλή*.³⁴

Then each of the divisions, the principal and subordinate ones alike, was presided over by a *head*. In the Old Testament the heads of the main divisions are designated *שָׂרִים* (princes)³⁵ or *רָאשִׁים* (heads).³⁶ At a subsequent period this latter (*ראש המשמר*) seems to have become the current designation, just as *ראש בית אב*³⁷ came to be the one regularly employed to denote the head of a sub-division. Then, besides these, we sometimes come across the term "elders" in this connection, *זקני כהונה* and *זקני בית אב*.³⁸

understood in *Bikkurim* iii. 12; *Jebamoth* xi. 7, *fin.*; *Baba kamma* ix. 12; *Temura* iii. 4, and *Para* iii. *fin.* *בית אב*, on the other hand, occurs in the sense of a sub-division or a division for one day's service, in *Joma* iii. 9, iv. 1; *Tamid* i. 1; *Middoth* i. 8.

³³ See Knobel-Dillmann, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, note on Ex. vi. 14 (p. 58).

³⁴ *πατριά*, Joseph. *Antt.* vii. 14. 7; *ἐφημερία*, Luke i. 5, 8; *ἐφημερίς* and *φυλή*, Joseph. *Vita*, 1 (see the quotation given above, note 29). We find mention made of a *φυλή* *ἑνιαχσίμ* in Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 8.

³⁵ *שָׂרֵי קָדֶשׁ*, Ezra viii. 24, 29, x. 5; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 14. *שָׂרֵי הַכֹּהֲנִים*, 1 Chron. xxiv. 5. That those *שָׂרִים* are identical with the *רָאשֵׁי אֲבוֹת* may be seen, above all, from 1 Chron. xv. 4-12, where both expressions are employed, as being perfectly synonymous, to denote the heads of the Levitical divisions.

³⁶ *רָאשֵׁי הָאֲבוֹת*, 1 Chron. xxiv. 4. *רָאשֵׁי הָאֲבוֹת*, Neh. xii. 12; 1 Chron. xxiv. 6. Comp. also Neh. xi. 13, xii. 7.

³⁷ *ראש המשמר* and *ראש בית אב*, Tosefta, *Horajoth*, *fin.*, ed. Zuckermann, p. 476; and *Jer. Horajoth* iii. fol. 48^b (the latter passage being given in Ugolini, *Thesaurus*, xiii. 870). *ראש המשמר* also in the passage quoted above, p. 182. *ראש בית אב*, *Joma* iii. 9, iv. 1.

³⁸ *זקני כהונה*, *Joma* i. 5. *זקני בית אב*, *Tamid* i. 1; *Middoth* i. 8.

The *importance* and *influence* of the various divisions was by no means alike. Notwithstanding their formal equality, in so far as they all took part in the services of the sanctuary in regular rotation, still those divisions, from the members of which high priests or other influential functionaries were selected, could not fail to acquire, in consequence, a greater amount of influence and importance. Hence we can quite believe that, as Josephus assures us, it was regarded as a great advantage to belong to the first of the twenty-four classes,³⁹ *i.e.* to the class Joiarib, which had the honour of contributing the Asmonaeen princes and high priests.⁴⁰ Then we find that within the individual classes again influential coteries were formed. The families living in Jerusalem would no doubt understand how to secure for members of their own circle the most important offices about the temple, knowing as they did how much influence they conferred upon those who filled them. But it was in the Roman period above all that the privileged families from which the high priests were drawn (see p. 173, above) were found to constitute a proud aristocracy, claiming to occupy a rank much superior to that of the ordinary priests. The social difference between the one circle and the other was so marked that, toward the close of the period just preceding the destruction of the temple, the high priests could even go the length of wresting the tithes from the other priests by violence, these latter being left to starve.⁴¹ As a consequence of this disparity of rank, their political sympathies were also so widely different that, at the outbreak of the revolution, the ordinary priests favoured this movement, whereas the high priests did everything in their power to allay the storm.⁴²

³⁹ *Vita*, 1: πολλὴ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο διαφορά = "there is a great advantage also in this."

⁴⁰ One feels tempted to assume that the lists in Chronicles (1 Chron. xxiv. 7-18) were not framed till the Asmonaeen period. For it is surely very strange that it is precisely the class Joiarib, from which the Asmonaeans were sprung, that is here put prominently at the top, while in the lists given in Nehemiah (xii. 1-7, 12-21) it occupies a somewhat subordinate place.

⁴¹ Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 8. 8, 9. 2.

⁴² Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 2-4.

We must be careful to distinguish between the priests properly so called and the *Levites*, a subordinate class of sacred officials.⁴³ It is true, no doubt, that this distinction is as yet unknown to the Book of Deuteronomy. There the Levites are all regarded as being as much entitled to share in the priestly functions as the rest, and "priests" and "Levites" are made use of simply as convertible terms (see especially, Deut. xviii. 5, xxi. 5; and generally, xvii. 9, 18, xviii. 1, xxiv. 8, xxvii. 9). The practice of distinguishing between the two orders is met with for the first time in Ezekiel; and there can scarcely be a doubt that it was precisely this prophet who was the first to introduce it. According to the legislation of Deuteronomy, all places of worship outside Jerusalem were to be suppressed. At the same time the "Levites" who officiated in them, *i.e.* the priests, were not deprived of their rights as such; all that was asked of them was that they should exercise their priestly functions exclusively in Jerusalem. This state of things however could hardly be expected to last long. In the first place it was too much to expect that the Jerusalem priests would long relish the idea of those colleagues from the provinces having the same right to officiate as themselves; but apart from this, there was the fact that they had been guilty, to a larger extent than the priests of Jerusalem, of blending the service of strange gods with the worship of Jehovah. Consequently Ezekiel now proceeded to push the state of things brought about by the Deuteronomist to what seemed to be its legitimate result: he prohibited the Levites from beyond Jerusalem from celebrating worship altogether. This was now to be the exclusive privilege of the Levites of the house of Zadok, *i.e.* of the Jerusalem priests. Hereafter none but the sons of Zadok were "to offer the fat and the blood

⁴³ See in general, Winer's *Realwörterb.* ii. 20 ff. Oehler's art. "Levi," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. viii. 347-358 (in the 2nd ed. it is revised by Orelli). Graf, *Zur Geschichte des Stammes Levi*, in Merx' *Archiv*, vol. i. Idem, art. "Levi," in Schenkel's *Bibellexicon*, iv. 29-32. Wellhausen, *Geschichte*, i. 123-156. Smend, *Exeget. Handbuch zu Ezekiel*, pp. 360-362. Dillmann, *Exeget. Handbuch zu Exodus und Leviticus*, pp. 455-461.

before God," that is to say, none but these were to minister at the altar or cross the threshold of the inner sanctuary (the temple proper). To the other Levites the more subordinate class of duties was assigned, viz. the keeping watch over the temple, the slaughtering of the victims, and such like. An arrangement such as this had, at the same time, this further advantage, that it was now possible entirely to dispense with those Gentiles whom it had been necessary to employ for the purpose of performing the more menial services connected with the temple (see in general, Ezek. xlv. 6-16). The order of things thus introduced by Ezekiel was the one that in all essential respects came to be permanently adopted. The distinction which he had established between priests and the other Levites is treated in the code of the priests as one that had already come to be regularly recognised. In this code the distinction between "the sons of Aaron," i.e. the priests, and the rest of the Levites, is rigidly observed. According to its enactments it is only the former who are to enjoy the right of ministering at the altar and within the sanctuary itself (Num. xviii. 7). The Levites, on the other hand, are merely to act as assistants to the sons of Aaron "in all the service of the tabernacle" (Num. xviii. 4). Accordingly, what they are allowed and are called upon to do is to help the priests by performing a great many duties and services of the most varied character in connection with the temple, such as taking charge of the revenues and the sacred property, the bringing forward and preparing of all the different materials required for the celebration of worship, and others of a like nature (for more on this matter, see Part III.). We also find that the duty of slaughtering and further preparing the victims was still assigned to them in later times precisely as it had been in that of Ezekiel.⁴⁴ Only they were debarred from

⁴⁴ 2 Chron. xxix. 34, xxxv. 11. Certainly from those passages one might infer that the Levites were called upon to assist in the slaughtering of the victims only in those instances in which a great many of them had to be dealt with. As a rule the priests performed the act of slaughtering the

taking part in the ministrations at the altar and within the walls of the sanctuary (Num. xviii. 3; see in general, Num. iii. 5-13 and xviii. 1-7).

Then, like the priests, the *Levites* came to form a strictly exclusive order, the privilege of belonging to which was based upon natural descent. Their origin was now ascribed to Levi, one of the twelve patriarchs of Israel (Ex. vi. 17-25; Num. iii. 14-39, iv. 34-49, xxvi. 57-62; 1 Chron. v. 27-vi. 66, and xxiii.). Consequently in their case too as well as that of the priests it was birth that decided the claim to participation in the rights and functions of their order. The "priests" stood to them very much in the relation in which a privileged family stands to the whole stock to which it belongs. For the origin of the priestly order now came to be ascribed to Aaron, a great-grandson of Levi (Ex. vi. 17 ff.).⁴⁵

But there is nothing that shows so plainly as just the history of the Levites itself how elastic and unsubstantial those genealogical theories were. In the post-exilic period, for example, we find that the "Levites," in the sense in which the term has been hitherto understood, were still *strictly distinguished* from the *musicians, doorkeepers and temple servants* (Nethinim, originally, at all events, slaves); this continues to be the case therefore not merely in the time of victims themselves. However, the law even went so far as to allow laymen to undertake this duty. See Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (1851), p. 134. Ritter's *Phila und die Halacha*, p. 110 ff.

⁴⁵ The genealogical derivation of the priests from Aaron is, in the first instance, merely a dogmatic postulate from which nothing whatever can be inferred with regard to the actual state of matters during the post-exilic period. Still it is undoubtedly a probable enough thing that, besides the "sons of Zadok," i.e. the old priestly families of Jerusalem, there were also a number of others who were not originally Jerusalem priests, who contrived to get their sacerdotal rights duly recognised. For the author of Chronicles, who traces the family of Zadok to Eleazar, Aaron's eldest son (1 Chron. vi. 4-12), derives a portion of the priests from Ithamar, another of Aaron's sons (1 Chron. xxiv.; comp. Ezra viii. 2). These latter therefore were not Zadokites. Consequently we must assume that, *although Ezekiel's scheme was carried out in the main, still it was not so in every particular*. Comp. Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*, p. 48.

Zerubbabel, but also between eighty and a hundred years later, viz. in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (see especially Ezra ii. 40-58 = Neh. vii. 43-60; further Ezra ii. 70, vii. 7, 24, x. 23, 24; Neh. vii. 1, 73, x. 29, 40, xii. 44-47, xiii. 5, 10). But gradually *the musicians and the doorkeepers* came to be included among the "Levites" also. For example, the circumstance of the musicians being now merged in the Levites is presupposed in several remodelled portions of the Book of Nehemiah.⁴⁶ Later on, a similar distinction seems to have been accorded to the doorkeepers as well, for we find the author of Chronicles taking special pains to let it appear that both of the classes here in question belonged to the order of the Levites, and also to show that they too were descended from Levi.⁴⁷ The musicians again were afterwards advanced a step higher still, in so far as, shortly before the destruction of the temple, King Agrippa II., with the concurrence of the Sanhedrim, conferred upon them the privilege of wearing linen robes similar to those worn by the priests.⁴⁸

The *Levites*, like the priests, were also divided into *courses of service*. But their history is involved in still greater obscurity than that of the courses of the priests. Among those who returned from exile with Zerubbabel and Joshua there were but very few "Levites" in the stricter sense of the word, only

⁴⁶ Neh. xi. 15-19, 22, 23, xii. 8, 9, 24, 25, 27-29. Here the *musicians* are uniformly regarded as belonging to the order of the Levites, while the *doorkeepers*, on the other hand, are expressly excluded from it. Consequently the portions in question (Neh. xi., xii.) must have come down to us in a revised form, representing a point of view intermediate between the standpoint of the oldest sources of the Book of Nehemiah on the one side, and that of the author of Chronicles on the other.

⁴⁷ On the inclusion of the *musicians* among the Levites, see 1 Chron. xv. 16 ff., xxiii. 3-5; 2 Chron. xxix. 25, and elsewhere. For the doorkeepers again, see 1 Chron. ix. 26, xv. 18, 23, 24, xxiii. 3-5. Further, for the tracing of their descent from Levi, particularly in the case of the three families of musicians, Heman, Asaph and Ethan, see 1 Chron. vi. 16-32; but for the same in the case of the doorkeepers as well, at least to a certain extent, viz. through Obed Edom, see Graf in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 230-232. However, it is still the practice in the Chronicles as well to distinguish between the *Nethinim* and the Levites, 1 Chron. ix. 2.

⁴⁸ Joseph. *Antt* xx. 9. 6.

seventy-four in all; while in addition to these there were 128 singers and 139 doorkeepers (Ezra ii. 40–42, the numbers in the corresponding passage, Neh. vii. 43–45, diverging somewhat from those just given). Then at length when Ezra came he managed to bring with him only thirty-eight “Levites,” and even these could be persuaded to accompany him only after serious expostulation (Ezra viii. 15–20). The disinclination to return thus shown by the Levites was owing to the subordinate place that had now been assigned them. It may be safely assumed however that those who did return would ere long receive considerable accessions to their ranks from those of their order that had never left their native country. For there cannot be a doubt that, as the “Levites” lived scattered all over the land, far fewer of them, comparatively speaking, were carried into captivity than of the “priests,” by whom at that time only the priests of Jerusalem were meant. And hence we are enabled to account for the fact that, in the catalogue of Levites and singers in the time of Zerubbabel and Joshua as given in Neh. xii. 8, we find a few more families than are to be met with in the catalogue of those who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii. 40 f.; Neh. vii. 43 f.).⁴⁹ In a list belonging to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah seventeen families of Levites in the stricter sense of the word are already enumerated (Neh. x. 10–14 and Bertheau’s note). In another, probably referring, like the former, to the time of Nehemiah as well,⁵⁰ it is only the number of the Levites dwelling in Jerusalem that is given, inclusive of course of the singers, and it estimates that there were 284 of them (Neh. xi. 15–18). It is to be presumed that the number of those who lived beyond the city, in the towns and villages of Judaea, would be considerably larger (Neh. xi. 20, 36).⁵¹ It would appear that, in the time of the author

⁴⁹ See Bertheau’s note, p. 251, of his *Exeget. Handbuch* to Nehemiah.

⁵⁰ On the period to which this list refers, see Bertheau’s *Exeget. Handbuch* to Chronicles, p. 99; to Nehemiah, p. 248.

⁵¹ The number of *priests* living in Jerusalem is stated in this same list

of Chronicles, the division into twenty-four classes was not confined to the priests, but had been adopted in the case of the Levites as well. This writer, although including the musicians and doorkeepers among the Levites, nevertheless distinguishes between three leading groups: the Levites who did service about the temple generally, then the musicians, and lastly the doorkeepers (1 Chron. xxiii. 3-5). He then proceeds in 1 Chron. xxiii. 6-24 to give, in the case of the Levites or first group, a list of the houses of their fathers (בית אבות), which, after one or two corrections have been made, probably amount to twenty-four.⁵⁷ As for the musicians again, he expressly divides them into twenty-four classes or courses (1 Chron. xxv.). With regard to the post-Biblical period we have testimony to the effect that at that time the division now in question had been regularly established in the case of the Levites generally, so that, in fact, each class of priests had now its corresponding class or course of Levites.⁵⁸ As in the case of the priests, so also in that of

to have been 1192 (Neh. xi. 10-14), while the aggregate number then living throughout the whole land is estimated at 6000 (according to Ezra ii. 36-39 and viii. 2; comp. p. 217, above). With regard to the Levites, on the other hand, we may venture to assume that formerly the proportion of those living beyond Jerusalem to those living within it was much greater still. In any case the number of the Levites in the stricter sense of the word must have exceeded that of the singers and doorkeepers. For when the author of Chronicles tells us that in David's time there were 24,000 Levites properly so called, and 4000 singers, and 4000 doorkeepers (1 Chron. xxiii. 4, 5), we may assume that the relative proportions of those numbers must have pretty nearly corresponded with what actually existed in the writer's own day, however much the absolute numbers themselves may have been exaggerated.

⁵⁷ See Bertheau's note on the passage. To the family of Gerson are assigned nine houses of their fathers, to that of Kahat nine also, and to that of Merari probably six, if, that is to say, we supply from xxiv. 26, 27 the three missing houses of Schoham, Sakkur and Ibri, and erase from xxiii. 23 the name Mahli which occurs twice in the list.

⁵⁸ Joseph. *Antt.* vii. 14. 7: ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ τῆς Δευτίτιδος φυλῆς εἴκοσι μέρη καὶ τέσσαρα, καὶ κληρωσαμένον κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀνέβησαν τρόπον ταῖς τῶν ἱερέων ἡφμερίσιν ἐπὶ ἡμέρας ὀκτώ. *Taanith* iv. 2: "The earliest prophets established twenty-four courses of service (משמרות). To each belonged a staff (מעמד) in Jerusalem, composed of priests, Levites and Israelites. As

the Levites, each of the various divisions or courses was presided over by a head (רָאשִׁים or שָׂרִים).⁵⁴

The question as to where the priests and Levites *resided* is one with regard to which we have very little information of a reliable kind; for we must here entirely dismiss from view the legislation with reference to the forty-eight Levitical cities, which never was more than a mere theory (Num. xxxv.; Josh. xxi.). One thing however is certain, and that is, that under the new order of things that obtained subsequent to the exile, only a fraction of the priests and Levites lived in Jerusalem itself, while the rest were scattered over the towns and villages of Judaea, the majority of them being probably within a short distance of the capital and the centre of worship. In the list in Neh. xi. 10-19, to which reference has been already made, the number of priests who lived in Jerusalem is stated to have been 1192,⁵⁵ that of the Levites and musicians 284, and that of the doorkeepers 172. But the sum-total of the whole priests of the land amounted to something like five times that number, if not more (see note 51), while in the case of the other categories the proportion of those living beyond the city to those within it may have been greater still. In any case, the general fact that priests as well as Levites had their residences in the towns and villages of Judaea is confirmed by repeated and unquestionable testimony.⁵⁶ But we are left with little or no information with respect to details.⁵⁷

soon as its turn to serve came round to a course, the priests and Levites belonging to it proceeded to Jerusalem, but the Israelites assembled in the synagogues of their different towns and there read the account of the creation."

⁵⁴ שָׂרִים, 1 Chron. xv. 4-12; 2 Chron. xxxv. 9. רָאשִׁים, Neh. xii. 22, 23; 1 Chron. ix. 33, 34, xv. 12, xxiii. 24, xxiv. 6, 31. The divisions whose heads are here in question are, of course, separate and distinct from each other.

⁵⁵ The parallel passage, 1 Chron. ix. 10-13, puts it at a somewhat higher figure.

⁵⁶ Ezra ii. 70; Neh. vii. 73, xi. 3, 20, 36; 2 Chron. xxxi. 15, 19.

⁵⁷ A number of places where musicians had settled are mentioned in Neh. xii. 27-29. The Maccabees came from Modein (1 Macc. ii. 1), Zacharias the priest lived in the hill country of Judah (Luke i. 39).

II. THE EMOLUMENTS.

The emoluments which the priests received from the people for their subsistence were, down to the time of the exile, of a very modest and rather precarious kind. But subsequent to this latter period they were augmented almost beyond measure. This fact enables us to see, in a peculiarly striking manner, what a vast increase of power and influence the priesthood had acquired through the new order of things that was introduced subsequent to the exile.⁵⁸ And this increase of power was, no doubt, the *cause* of the loftier pretensions of the order, just as, on the other hand, it was in turn also the *effect* of the augmenting of the temporalities. Nor was it ever in the power of the scribes, who came after and who in themselves were not always favourably disposed toward the priests, to do anything in the way of altering this state of matters, now that the priestly law had been for so long the acknowledged law of God. Nay, it was for this very reason that the scribes only found themselves in the position of contributing towards the yet further increase of the priests' emoluments. For proceeding as they did on the view that a man always secured for himself the divine approval in proportion to the punctuality and readiness with which he conformed to the requirements of the law, they almost invariably interpreted its prescriptions in a sense favourable to the priests. And so we have the singular spectacle of an age that had already begun to regard the priests with distrust, helping nevertheless to confirm and increase their power.

In the times previous to the exile there were as yet almost no *imposts in the strict sense* of the word at all, that is to say, none which were not connected with sacrifice, none which

According to Origen, Bethphage was a village where priests lived, *Comment. in Matt.* vol. xvi. cap. xvii. (Lommatzsch, iv. 52): ἐρμηνεύεσθαι δὲ φαμεν τὴν Βηθφαγὴ μὲν οἶκον σιαγόνων, ἧτις τῶν ἱερέων ἦν χωρίον.

⁵⁸ For a correct appreciation of these matters we are indebted first and foremost to the modern criticism of the Pentateuch. See especially, Wellhausen's *Geschichte Israels*, i. 156-164.

had the character of a pure tax. Allowances to the priests were only exacted on the occasion of sacrifices being offered, and only in connection with these. The person who came to sacrifice brought the choicest portions of the produce of his fields and the first-born of his cattle to offer to Jehovah. Of this one part was consumed upon the altar, another fell to the officiating priest, but the most of it was made use of by the offerer himself, who was required to hold a sacrificial feast with it in the presence of Jehovah. It is in this sense that we are to understand the requirement already met with in *the earliest (Jehovistic) legislation*, to the effect that the best of the produce of the field and the first-born of the cattle were to be brought before Jehovah (firstlings of the field, Ex. xxii. 28, xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 26; the first-born of the cattle, Ex. xiii. 11–16, xxii. 29, xxxiv. 19, 20).^{58a} The prescriptions in *Deuteronomy* bearing on this matter are perfectly plain and unequivocal. This book knows nothing whatever either of the exacting of the tithe, or of the first-born on the part of the priests. It was required no doubt that the tithe of the fruits of the field was to be separated and conveyed to Jerusalem to the sanctuary. But there it was not given to the priest, but consumed by the owner of it himself; and it was only every third year that it fell to the Levites, *i.e.* the priests, and to the poor (Deut. xiv. 22–29, xxvi. 12–15; comp. also xii. 6, 11, 17–19). It was precisely the same in the case of the firstlings of the sheep and oxen. These too, and that such of them as were males, were required to be brought to the sanctuary at Jerusalem, but they were consumed there by the owner himself in sacrificial feasts (Deut. xv. 19–23; comp. also xii. 6, 17–19, xiv. 23). Of all the things here mentioned the priests received only certain portions, that is to say, of the fruits of the field that were presented they got only the ראשית, *i.e.* the best (Deut. xviii. 4, xxvi. 1–11),

^{58a} The more subtle point as to whether Ex. xiii. 11–16 and xxxiv. 19, 20 belong to the Jehovist himself or were inserted by a kindred spirit, may here be left an open question. For the latter view, see Wellhausen, *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol.* 1876, pp. 542 ff., 553 ff.; for the former, see Dillmann, *Exeget. Handbuch* to Ex. and Lev. pp. 99, 334.

while of the animals offered, they got merely the shoulder, the two cheeks and the stomach of each (Deut. xviii. 3). Beyond this there is no mention of anything else that was required to be given to the priest except a part of the fleece at the sheep-shearing (Deut. xviii. 4). As corroborative of what we have been saying we would point to the prescriptions of Ezekiel (xliv. 28-30). Although a priest himself and showing an undoubted disposition to favour rather than to discourage the pretensions of his order, still he says quite as little about a tithe and the first-born being required to be given to the priests. The claims he makes on behalf of these latter are no doubt somewhat higher than those of Deuteronomy, still, on the whole, they move on the same lines. While Deuteronomy assigns to the priests only two portions of the victims, Ezekiel requires the whole of the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings (which as yet are quite unknown to Deuteronomy) to be given to them, and similarly with regard to the meat-offerings as well (Ezek. xliv. 29); also every "dedicated thing" (xliv. 29); and lastly, the *reshith*, i.e. the best of the first-fruits, the choicest portions of offerings of every description, and of the dough in baking (xliv. 30).

But we find a considerable advance upon all the exactions we have just been referring to when we come to those contained in the *priest-code*, which, in its enumeration of the various emoluments of the priests as given in Num. xviii. 8-32, coincides in many respects with Ezekiel, only it introduces in addition what constitutes a most important innovation, the tithe and the first-born. Like Ezekiel, the priest-code also assigns the sin-offerings, the trespass-offerings and the meat-offerings, at least the greater portion of the latter, to the priests (Num. xviii. 9, 10; for fuller details, see Lev. i.-vii.). Of those sacrifices which their owners themselves were at liberty to make use of in furnishing the sacrificial feast (the so-called *זִבְחֵי שְׁלָמִים*), the priests were to get the breast and the right shoulder (Lev. vii. 30-34), thus obtaining considerably choicer portions than those assigned to them in Deuteronomy

Again, as in Ezekiel so also in the priest-code, the priests are to get everything "dedicated" (Num. xviii. 14), and the choicest portions (the *reshith*) of the produce of the soil: the oil, the wine and the wheat (Num. xviii. 12). But to the *reshith*, the first-fruits, *בְּכֹרִים*, are further added (Num. xviii. 13) as an impost of a different sort; then, in the last place, comes the most important item of all, one that considerably exceeded in value all the former ones, viz. the tithe (Num. xviii. 20–32) and the first-born (Num. xviii. 15–18). The tithe however belonged, in the first instance, to the "Levites," who in turn were required to pay a tenth part of it to the priests. With regard to the portion of the dough that was to be given to the priests, though omitted in the leading enumeration of the emoluments, it too is mentioned in the priest-code, but in a different place (Num. xv. 17–21). We find that in Nehemiah's day those enactments were already in full force. According to Neh. x. 36–40, it was already the practice at that time for the priests to receive the first-fruits or *bikkurim* (x. 36), the choicest portions of the fruits of the soil, which here, precisely as in the priest-code, are clearly distinguished alike from the first-fruits and the tithe (x. 38), then the tithe after the manner described in the priest-code (x. 38–40), then the first-born (x. 37), and lastly, the portion of the dough (x. 38). By the tithe here we are always to understand the tithe of the fruits of the ground and of the trees. But there is *one* passage in the priest-code where, in addition to the tithe just mentioned, that of the cattle is also exacted (Lev. xxvii. 32, 33). But it may well be presumed that this requirement, standing there as it does in so entirely isolated a fashion, did not originally form part of the code.⁵⁹ It would seem that the tithe of the cattle was actually exacted and paid in the time of the author of Chronicles; or possibly we have only to regard it as forming part of this writer's conceptions of what ought to be (2 Chron. xxxi. 6). In post-

⁵⁹ See Wellhausen, *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1877, p. 444; also his *Geschichte Israels*, i. 162.

Biblical times the whole passage, Lev. xxvii. 30–33, has been understood as referring to a tithe in the sense of the one demanded by Deuteronomy.

The legal prescriptions of Deuteronomy and of the priests' code have not only been blended together so as to form one whole in a literary sense, but they would also appear to have been combined with each other in actual practice. Consequently we find that the *law in its later developments* has considerably augmented the already heavy imposts of the priest-code. With the Levites' tithe of this code there was now conjoined, and simply as "*a second tithe*," the one prescribed in Deuteronomy, and which was to be consumed by the owner himself before Jehovah. The discrepancy between the prescriptions of the code and those of Deuteronomy, with respect to the portions of the victims that were to be given to the priests, was now got rid of by regarding the former as referring exclusively to the victims offered in sacrifice, and the latter to such animals as were slaughtered for ordinary use. Of the former of these the priests, according to Lev. vii. 30–34, were to receive the breast and the right shoulder, while of the latter they were to get, according to Deut. xviii. 3, a fore-leg, the cheeks, and the stomach. Lastly, to all the imposts of the priest-code there was further added the portion of the fleece at the sheep-shearing as prescribed in Deuteronomy (xviii. 4). From this process of amalgamation there resulted the following list of the priests' emoluments, which we may venture to regard as the one that was in force in the time of Christ.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ Philo already gives us a synopsis in his treatise, entitled *De praemiis sacerdotum et honoribus* (Opp. ed. Mangey, ii. 232–237); comp. besides, Ritter's *Philo und die Halacha*, 1879, pp. 114–126. Further, Josephus in the leading passage on the subject, *Antt.* iv. 4. 4, with which iii. 9. 1–4 (sacrificial offerings) and iv. 8. 22 (firstlings) may be compared. The Rabbinical writers, according to an artificial system of reckoning, represent the various sources of the priests' emoluments as having amounted to twenty-four in all; see Tosefta, *Challa* ii. 7–9 (ed. Zuckermann); *Jer. Challa* iv. *fin.* fol. 60b; *Bab. Baba kamma* 110b, *Chullin* 133b; *Pesikta* in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xiii. pp. 1122–1128. Several of the twenty-four in

(I.) Of the *victims* the following portions fell to the priests:—(1) The *sin-offerings* in their entirety, at least as a rule, for only two, and that of a particular sort, were required to be burnt without the camp.⁶¹ (2) The trespass-offerings in their entirety also.⁶² In both instances it was only the fat that was burnt upon the altar, the flesh belonged to the priests. (3) Of the *meat-offerings* again they got by far the larger portion, for as a rule only a small part of it was reserved to burn upon the altar, while the rest fell to the priests.⁶³ All the sacrifices we have just mentioned were of very frequent occurrence, particularly the meat-offerings, which might not only be offered independently by themselves, but which also formed a necessary accompaniment to the majority of the animal sacrifices.^{63a} To the same category we have further to refer (4) the twelve cakes of *shewbread*, a fresh supply of which was placed in the temple every week, while

question are already enumerated in Mishna, *Challa* iv. 9. For the Talmudic passages, see also Reland's *Antiquitates sacrae*, ii. 4. 11, in Bernard's edition of Josephus, note on *Antt.* iv. 4. 4, and in Havercamp's edition, note on the same passage; and for a German rendering of them, Saalschütz, *Das mosaische Recht*, i. 351. Among modern writers the most complete and most correct lists comparatively speaking are given by Saalschütz, *Das mosaische Recht*, i. 343–353, and Haneberg, *Die religiösen Alterthümer der Bibel*, pp. 565–582. Authentic material also in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xiii. 1055–1129.

⁶¹ Lev. v. 13, vi. 19, 22 f.; Num. xviii. 9, 10; Ezek. xlv. 29. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 9. 3. *Sifra* to Lev. vi. 19 ff., in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xiii. p. 1071 ff. For the sin- and trespass-offerings generally, see Lev. iv.–vii. Winer's *Realwörterb.* ii. pp. 429–435.

⁶² Lev. vii. 6, 7; Num. xviii. 9, 10; Ezek. xlv. 29. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 9. 3; *Sifra* to Lev. vii. 6, 7, in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, xiii. 1078.

⁶³ Lev. ii. 3, 10, vi. 9–11, vii. 9, 10, 14, x. 12, 13; Num. xviii. 9, 10; Ezek. xlv. 29. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 9. 4: τὴν δὲ λοιπὴν οἱ ἱερεῖς πρὸς τροφὴν λαμβάνουσιν, ἣ ἐψηθεῖσαν (ἐλαίῳ γὰρ συμπεφύραται) ἢ γενομένων ἄρτων. On the meat-offerings generally, see Lev. ii. the whole chapter, and vi. 7–11, also Winer's *Realwörterb.* under the word.

^{63a} If we want to form some idea of the frequency of many of those sacrifices, we have only to read the laws relating to Levitical defilement and the mode of treating it with a view to its removal (Lev. xi.–xv.; Num. xix.). For example, *every woman after childbirth* had to offer a lamb as a burnt-offering and a pigeon as a sin-offering, or in the event of her being too poor for this, one pigeon as a burnt-offering and another as a sin-offering, Lev. xii. 1–8; Luke ii. 24.

that which was taken away became the property of the priests.⁶⁴ All the four classes of offerings now mentioned were "most holy," and as such could only be consumed in a *holy place*, i.e. within the inner court of the temple, and exclusively by the priests themselves (and not by their relations as well).⁶⁵

The regulations were not so stringent with regard to the two following offerings, viz. (5) the *thank-offerings* and (6) the *burnt-offerings*. Of the former, the *זִבְחֵי שְׁלָמִים*, i.e. those offerings which were consumed by the offerers themselves, and by Luther rendered "Dankopfer," or as it should rather be "Mahlopfers," the priests received two parts of each, viz. the breast and the right shoulder. These might be eaten in any "clean place," and therefore not within the sanctuary as in the previous instances, and that not by the priest alone, but by all who were connected with the priestly order as well, even by their wives and daughters.⁶⁶ Lastly, of the burnt-offerings (6), the priests received comparatively speaking least of all, for they were entirely consumed upon the altar. But even of these they got the skins at least, and, considering how frequently sacrifices of this sort were offered, it was certainly not without good reason that Philo estimated the amount of revenue from this source also as something very considerable.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ Lev. xxiv. 5-9; for the *Sifra* to this as also the other Rabbinical passages, see Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xiii. p. 1084 ff.; see also Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 10. 7; Matt. xii. 4; Mark ii. 26; Luke vi. 4. For the principle on which they were divided, see *Sukka* v. 7, 8 (the retiring course of service got the one half and the incoming one the other half).

⁶⁵ Num. xviii. 10 and the passages cited in the preceding notes; also Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 4. 4, *fin.*

⁶⁶ Lev. vii. 30-34, x. 14, 15. *Sifra* to Lev. vii. 30-34, in Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. xiii. p. 1094 ff. Philo, *De praemiis sacerdotum*, sec. iii. (ed. Mang. ii. 234): παντός γὰρ ἱερείου προστέτακται δύο τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἀπὸ δυοῖν δίδοσθαι μελῶν, βραχίονα μὲν ἀπὸ χειρὸς δεξιᾶς, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ στήθους ὅσον πῖον. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 9. 2: τὸ δὲ στήθος καὶ τὴν νῆμην τὴν δεξιάν τοῖς ἱερεῦσι παρασχόντες. On the peace-offerings generally, see Lev. iii. the whole chapter, vii. 11-21, 28-34. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Dankopfer."

⁶⁷ Lev. vii. 8; the *Sifra* thereto in Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. xiii. p. 1079. Mishna, *Sebachim* xii. 2-4. Tosefta, *Sebachim* (or *Korbanoth*) xi. 7 ff. in Ugolini's *Thes* xiii 1080 ff. Philo, *De praemiis sacerdotum*, sec. iv. (Mang.

II. But considerable as the amount derived from those offerings no doubt was, still it formed but the smaller portion of the sacerdotal revenues, while for the most part it was only available for the officiating priests. The real bulk of the priests' emoluments, on the other hand, consisted strictly speaking of what was derived from *those dues that were paid independently of the sacrifices altogether*, and which consequently possessed the character of a genuine tax for the maintenance of the priesthood. These dues were levied partly upon the produce of the soil and partly upon the offspring of the cattle, and they had to be paid partly in kind, although in some instances they might also be ransomed for their equivalent in money. The dues derived from the *produce of the soil* were of a varied character, and had to be separated (with a view to payment) in the following order:⁶⁸ (1) The *first-fruits*, כִּבְרִיִּים. These offerings were taken from the so-called "seven kinds," i.e. from the principal products of the soil of Palestine as enumerated in Deuteronomy (viii. 8), viz. wheat, barley, vines, fig-trees, pomegranates, olives and honey. Those who lived in the vicinity of Jerusalem offered fresh fruits, while those living farther away brought them in a dried form. In going up to present their offerings the people went in common procession, and according to Philo and the Mishna it was made an occasion of merry-making. It was the practice for those living in the country to assemble in the principal towns of the districts to which they belonged and thence to go up to Zion in one merry company, marching to the music of the pipes. At the head of the procession was led the ox that was to form the festive offering, with its horns gilded and a garland of olive branches placed upon them. In Jerusalem the most eminent members of the priesthood came

ii. 235): 'Εφ' ἀπασι μέντοι καὶ τὰς τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων ἀμύθητα ■ ταῦτ ἐστὶ, δορὰς προστάττει τοὺς ὑπηρετοῦντας ταῖς θυσίαις ἱερεῖς λαμβάνειν, οὐ βραχέϊαν ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα πολυχρήματον δωρεάν. Josephus, *Antt.* iii. 9. 1. Ritter's *Philo und die Halacha*, p. 126. On the burnt-offerings generally, see Lev. i. 3-17. Winer's *Realwörterb.* under the word "Brandopfer."

⁶⁸ On the order to be observed, see *Terumoth* iii. 6, 7.

to meet the procession as it approached the sanctuary. The owners of the offerings then put wreaths round the baskets containing the first-fruits and carried them on their shoulders up the temple mount as far as the court. This was done even by the most distinguished personages; it had been done even by King Agrippa himself. As soon as the procession entered the court the Levites welcomed it with the singing of the thirtieth Psalm. And now each person proceeded to hand his basket to the priest, and as he did so, repeated the confession of Deut. xxvi. 5-10, whereupon the priest took it and put it down beside the altar.⁶⁹ (2) Then came *the so-called terumah* (תרומה). This was distinct from the first-fruits, and in so far as the offering of these latter had always rather more of a symbolico-religious significance, it hardly could be said to have belonged to quite the same category with them. The *terumah* possessed the character of a pure payment in kind toward the maintenance of the priests, for Rabbinical Judaism understands it in the more restricted sense of the term (*terumah* in the more comprehensive sense of the word meaning every "heave" whatsoever, *i.e.* everything paid to the sanctuary) as denoting *the giving of the choicest of the fruits of the ground and of the trees* to the priests. This impost was levied not only upon the "seven kinds," but upon every species of fruit, and that whether the fruits of the ground or the fruit of trees. Here as before the most important of them were wheat, wine and oil. The amount to be given was not regulated by any

⁶⁹ See in general, Num. xviii. 13; Neh. x. 36; also Ex. xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 26. To this matter Deut. xxvi. 1-11 was referred. Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 8. 22. In the Mishna the entire tractate *Bikkurim* is devoted to the subject of first-fruits. Comp. especially, *Bikkurim* i. 3 (regarding the "seven kinds" to be offered), and iii. 1-9 (account of the festive procession). Philo treats of this matter in his small work, *De festo cophini*, first edited by Cardinal Mai, and given in Richter's edition of Philo's works, v. 48-50; also in Tischendorf's *Philonea* (1868), pp. 69-71. Of the works given under the literature we would specially mention, Lundius, *Die alten jüdischen Heiligtümer*, book iii. chap. liv. Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. iii. p. 1100 ff. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Erstlinge." Saalschütz, i. 344 f. Haneberg, pp. 565-568. Grätz, *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissensch. des Judenth* 1877, p. 433 ff.

fixed measure, weight, or number,⁷⁰ but was to be, on an average, one-fiftieth of the whole yield, the person who gave one-fortieth being regarded as giving liberally, while he who gave only one-sixtieth was considered to have given somewhat stingily.⁷¹ Whatever had once been set apart as a *terumah* could be lawfully made use of only by the priests.⁷² (3) After the materials of the two classes of offerings we have just mentioned had been duly separated, the largest and most important item of all now fell to be deducted, viz. the *tithe*. We know, from what the Gospels tell us, with what painful scrupulosity the prescriptions of the law in regard to this matter were observed, and how common it was to pay tithe even of the most insignificant and worthless objects, such as mint, anise, and cummin (Matt. xxiii.; Luke xi. 42). The principle laid down in the Mishna with respect to this is as follows: "Everything which may be used as food and is cultivated and grows out of the earth is liable to tithe."⁷³ The

⁷⁰ *Terumoth* i. 7.

⁷¹ *Terumoth* iv. 3. Comp. Jerome's com. on Ezek. xlv. 13, 14 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, v. 565): At vero primitiva quae de frugibus offerebant, non erant speciali numero definita, sed offerentium arbitrio derelicta. Traditionemque accepimus Hebraeorum non lege praeceptam, sed magistrorum arbitrio molitam: qui plurimum, *quadragesimam partem* dabat sacerdotibus, qui minimum, *sexagesimam*: inter quadragesimam et sexagesimam licebat offerre quodcumque voluissent.

⁷² See in general, Num. xviii. 12; Neh. x. 38. The Rabbinical regulations in the tractate *Terumoth*. Philo, *De praemiis sacerdotum*, sec. i. (Mang. ii. p. 233): προστάττει καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἄλλης κτήσεως ἀπάρχεσθαι, καθ' ἐκάστην μὲν ληνὸν οἶνον, καθ' ἐκάστην δὲ ἄλωνα σῖτον καὶ κριθάς. Ὁμοίως δὲ ἐξ ἔλαιων ἔλαιον καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀκροδρύων ἡμέρους καρπούς (that it is the *terumah* that Philo has in view here has also been correctly assumed by Richter in his *Philo und die Halacha*). Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 4. 4: ἔτι ■ ἀπάρχας τὸν λαὸν δίκαιον τῷ θεῷ πάντων τῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς φυομένων καρπῶν ἐπιφέρειν. Comp. also Lundius, *Die alten jüdischen Heiligthümer*, book iv. chap. xxxi. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Erstlinge." Saalschütz, i. 346. Haneberg, p. 568 f.

⁷³ *Maaseroth* i. 1. For details, comp. for example *Maaseroth* iv. 5, 6, v. 8. Lightfoot, *Horae hebr.*, note on Matt. xxiii. 23 (*Opp.* ii. 359). Wetzstein, *Nov. Test.*, note on the same passage. On the tithing of anise (ἀνηθον, תבשׁ), see *Maaseroth* iv. 5; on that of cummin (κύμινον, קימין). *Demai* ii. 1.

revenue derived from the source now in question must have been very large indeed. Yet the greater proportion of it was intended not so much for the priests as for the more subordinate class of sacred officials, viz. the *Levites*. It was to these latter, in the first instance, that the tithe had to be paid, while they had in turn to hand over a tithe of that again to the priests.⁷⁴ After separating this Levites' tithe from his produce, the owner had to deduct another one still, the so-called *second tithe*. But this, in common with several other imposts of a similar kind, was made use of by the owner himself in the way of furnishing a sacrificial feast at Jerusalem; consequently they were not for the benefit of the priests, and so do not fall to be considered here.⁷⁵ (4) Then the last of the offerings taken

⁷⁴ See in general, Num. xviii. 20-32; Neh. x. 38-40. Philo, *De caritate*, sec. x. (ed. Mang. ii. 391); *De praemiis sacerdot.* sec. vi.; probably it is also the tithe that is in view in sec. ii. *init.* of the same treatise. Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 4. 3, 4. The Rabbinical prescriptions in *Maaseroth*. Hottinger, *De decimis Judaeorum*, Lugd. Bat. 1713. Lundius, *Die alten jüd. Heiligthümer*, book iv. chap. xxxii. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Zehnt." Saalschütz, i. 346 f. Haneberg, pp. 573-576. Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. xviii. 414-421. Ritter, *Philo und die Halacha*, pp. 122-124. Knobel-Dillmann, *Exeget. Handbuch*, note on Lev. xxvii. 30-33 (also at the same place for the instances of a similar practice among the heathen).

⁷⁵ To the category of imposts that were consumed by the owner himself at Jerusalem belong—

(1) The "*second tithe*," according to Deut. xiv. 22-26. Lev. xxvii. 30, 31 was likewise understood in this sense. Comp. Tob. i. 7; Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 8. 8. In the Mishna see the whole tractate *Maaser sheni*. Hottinger, *De decimis Judaeorum*, pp. 146-182 (*Exercit.* vii.). Lundius, *Die alten jüd. Heiligthümer*, iv. 33. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Zehnt." Saalschütz, i. pp. 169, 354-358. Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. xviii. p. 417 f. Those living at a distance from Jerusalem were allowed to convert the second tithe into money on the understanding that one-fifth of its money value was to be superadded to it (Lev. xxvii. 31; *Maaser sheni* iv. 3). But this money had to be spent exclusively in the purchase of such viands, beverages, and ointment as were necessary for the sacrificial feast at Jerusalem (Deut. xiv. 26; *Maaser sheni* ii. 1).

(2) The *tithe of the cattle*. The only passage in the Pentateuch which requires the *cattle* to be tithed, viz. Lev. xxvii. 32, 33, was expressly understood by the later legislation in the sense of the "*second tithe*," and that being the case, it follows that the cattle tithe would also be devoted to the furnishing of the feasts in Jerusalem. See *Sebachim* v. 8. Bartenora

from the products of the soil was the so-called *challah* (חֶלֶק), i.e. the offering from the kneaded dough (ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ

and Maimonides on *Bechoroth* ix. 1 (in Surenhusius' edition of the *Mishna*, v. 187). At the same time, Philo would seem to include the cattle tithe also among the priests' emoluments, *De caritate*, sec. x. (Mang. ii. 391); *De praemiis sacerdotum*, sec. ii. *init.* (where the tithe is probably meant). Comp. Ritter's *Philo und die Halacha*, p. 122 f. For a fuller account of the matter, see *Mishna*, *Bechoroth* ix. 1-8; also *Maaser sheni* i. 2; *Shekalim* i. 7, iii. 1, viii. 8; *Rosh hashana* i. 1; *Chagiga* i. 4; *Sebachim* v. 8, x. 3; *Manachoth* ix. 6; *Chullin* i. 7. Hottinger, *De decimis Judaeorum*, pp. 228-253 (*Exercit. x.*). Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heilighth.* book iv. chap. xxxviii.

(3) The produce of trees and vines in the fourth year of their growth. According to Lev. xix. 23-25, the fruit of newly-planted trees (and vines) was not to be gathered at all during the first three years, while in the fourth it was to be consecrated to God, as it was not to be at the free disposal of the owner of it till the fifth year. In later times this was taken to mean that the produce of the fourth year was, like the second tithe, to be consumed by the owner himself in Jerusalem. See especially, Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 8. 19: τῷ δὲ τετάρτῳ τρυγάτω πᾶν τὸ γεόμενον (τότε γὰρ ἄριον εἶναι) καὶ συναγαγὼν εἰς τὴν ἱερὰν πόλιν κομίζετω, καὶ σὺν τῇ δεκάτῃ τοῦ ἄλλου καρποῦ μετὰ τῶν φίλων εὐωχοῦμενος ἀναλισκέτω καὶ μετ' ὀρφανῶν καὶ χηρευουσῶν γυναικῶν. Comp. also Philo, *De caritate*, sec. xxi. (Mang. ii. 402). *Mishna*, *Pea* vii. 6; *Maaser sheni* v. 1-5; *Orla* throughout; *Edujoth* iv. 5. Guisius on *Pea* vii. 6 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, i. 68). Hottinger, *De jure plantae quarti anni juxta praeceptum Lev. xix. 24*, Marburg 1704. Saalschütz, i. 168 f.

(4) Then, in the last place, among the offerings that did not fall to the priests were those intended for the benefit of the poor, viz.: (a) the gleanings of the fields and what grew upon the edges of them when the corn was reaped, Lev. xix. 9, 10, xxiii. 22; Deut. xxiv. 19-22. Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 8. 21. Philo, *De caritate*, sec. ix. (Mang. ii. 390). *Mishna*, *Pea*. (b) The so-called *third tithe*, or the *tithe for the poor*. According to the terms of the prescription (Deut. xiv. 28, 29, xxvi. 12) on which this tithe is based one should expect that, strictly speaking, the tithe for the poor would alternate with the second tithe. For Deuteronomy prescribes that the tithe that in the other two years was consumed by the owner himself before Jehovah, was in the third year to be assigned to the Levites and the poor. So too according to the Sept. version of Deut. xxvi. 12: (ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ τρίτῳ) τὸ δεύτερον ἐπιδέκατον δώσεις τῷ Λευίτῃ καὶ τῷ προσηλύτῃ καὶ τῷ ὀρφανῷ καὶ τῇ χήρᾳ. But it became the practice in later times to superadd the tithe for the poor to the second tithe every third year. See Tob. i. 7, 8. Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 8. 22. *Pea* viii. 2-9. *Demai* iv. 3, 4. *Maaser sheni* v. 6. *Jadajim* iv. 3. *Targum of Jonathan* on Deut. xxvi. 12. Jerome's commentary on Ezekiel xlv. 13, 14 (ed. Vallarsi, v. 565). Guisius's note on *Pea* viii. 2 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna* i. 70). Bernard and Havercamp's editions of Josephus, notes on *Antt.* iv. 8. 22. Hottinger, *De decimis*

φυράματος, Rom. xi. 16). According to the Mishna, offerings of this sort required to be given in the case of dough that happened to be made from any one of the five following kinds of grain: wheat, barley, spelt, oats, and rye (?).⁷⁶ The offering was not to be presented in the form of flour or meal, but required to be taken from the dough, *i.e.* as prepared for making bread.⁷⁷ The quantity to be given was, in the case of private individuals, one twenty-fourth part, and, in the case of public bakers, one forty-eighth part of the whole piece.⁷⁸

Then there was a second leading class of regular offerings, *viz.* those derived from the rearing of cattle. These were of three different kinds: (1) The most important of them was that consisting of the *male first-born* of the cattle (that is to say therefore, the first-born whenever it happened to be a male). As far back as the earlier Jehovistic and Deuteronomist legislation we find that the male first-born of the cattle was required to be dedicated to God, *i.e.* was to be used in sacrifice and for sacrificial feasts (Ex. xiii. 11–16, xxii. 28, 29, xxxiv. 19, 20; Deut. xv. 19–23). This the priestly legislation has converted into an allowance to be given to the priests (Ex. xiii. 1, 2; Lev. xxvii. 26, 27; Num. xviii. 15–18; Neh. x. 37). Both legislations add to this the *first-born among men* as well, for these two were regarded as,

Judaeorum, pp. 182–203. Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heiligth.*, book iv. chap. xxxiv. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Zehnt." Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. xviii. p. 418 f.

⁷⁶ *Challa* i. 1. There is some doubt as to the meaning of the two words usually rendered "oats" and "rye" (שועל and שיפון); especially with regard to שיפון = σίφων, σιφώνιον, it would certainly be more correct to understand the word as meaning a species of oats.

⁷⁷ *Challa* ii. 5.

⁷⁸ *Challa* ii. 7. See in general, Num. xv. 17–21; Neh. x. 38; Ezek. xlv. 30. Philo, *De praemiis sacerdotum*, sec. i. (Mang. ii. 233): Κελεύει γὰρ τοὺς σιτοπονοῦντας ἀπὸ παντὸς στέατος τε καὶ φυράματος ἄρτον ἀφαιρῆν ἀπαρχὴν εἰς ἱερέων χρῆσιν. Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 4. 4: τοὺς τε πέττοντας τὸν σίτον καὶ ἄρτοποιουμένους τῶν πεμμάτων αὐτοῖς τινὰ χορηγεῖν. Mishna tractate, *Challa*. *Sifra* to Num. xv. 17 ff. in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xiii. p. 1108 ff. Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heiligth.* book iv. chap. xxxix. Saalschütz, i. 347. Haneberg, pp. 571–573. Ritter's *Philo und die Halacha*, p. 118.

properly speaking, belonging to God, and consequently they required to be ransomed. Further, as a distinction had to be made between clean and unclean cattle, we accordingly have the following more specific regulations with respect to the first-born: ⁷⁹ (a) the first-born of the cattle that were *clean* and suitable for sacrificial purposes, *i.e.* oxen, sheep and goats, were to be given *in natura*. If they were free from blemish they were to be treated as sacrifices, *i.e.* the blood was to be sprinkled upon the altar and the fat consumed in the altar fires.⁸⁰ The flesh could be eaten by all who were connected with the order of the priests, even by their wives, and that in any part of Jerusalem (Num. xviii. 17, 18; Neh. x. 37; Ex. xxii. 29, xxxiv. 19; Deut. xv. 19, 20).⁸¹ But if, on the other hand, the animals had any blemish about them, they belonged no less to the priests, only they were to be treated as unconsecrated food (Deut. xv. 21–23).⁸² (b) The first-born of *unclean* animals above all, according to Philo, those of the horse, the ass, and the camel—and here too as in every other instance only the male ones—were to be ransomed by the payment of a certain sum of money fixed by the priest with a fifth part added (Num. xviii. 15; Neh. x. 37; Lev. xxvii. 27). An ass was to be exchanged for a sheep (Ex. xiii. 13, xxxiv. 20). According to Josephus, the ransom would appear to have been effected by the payment of a fixed sum of one shekel and a half for each beast. (c) The *first-born of man*, *i.e.* the first child that happened to be a male,

⁷⁹ Subsequent practice amalgamated the Jehovistic and Deuteronomic enactments with those of the priest-code, and made the latter the standard by which to interpret them.

⁸⁰ Consequently the Mishna characterizes the first-born also as “holy,” but only in the second degree, קדשים קלים, like *passa* and the cattle tithe, *Sebachim* v. 8.

⁸¹ In the passage in Deuteronomy the “thou” of xv. 20 has been understood as though it were addressed to the *priests* and not (as was the original intention of the passage) to the *Israelites*.

⁸² Accordingly, in cases of this sort the flesh might be sold by the priests even to persons who did not belong to their own order and eaten by them; see Bartenora’s note on *Bechoroth* v. 1 (in Surenhusius’ *Mishna*, v. 169).

required to be "ransomed" as soon as it was a month old by the payment of five shekels (Num. xviii. 15, 16; comp. Num. iii. 44 ff.; Neh. x. 37; Ex. xiii. 13, xxii. 28, xxxiv. 20). It was not necessary that the boy should be presented at the temple on the occasion of his being ransomed, as has been supposed, for the most part on the strength of Luke ii. 22.⁸³ As is expressly stated in the passages just referred to, the shekels in question were to be those of the Tyrian standard.⁸⁴ This tax was imposed upon poor and rich alike.⁸⁵

(2.) *Of all the flesh that was slaughtered generally* the priests were to receive three portions, viz. the shoulder, the two

⁸³ See, on the other hand, Löw, *Die Lebensalter in der jüdischen Literatur* (1875), p. 110 ff.

⁸⁴ *Bechoroth* viii. 7. A shekel of the Phoenician (=the early Hebrew) standard amounted to somewhere about 2 marks 62 pfennige of German money (Hultsch, *Griechische und römische Metrologie*, 2nd ed. p. 420), and consequently five shekels would be equivalent to about 13 marks. There can be no question that, by the "ransoming," the older legislation (Ex. xiii. 13, xxxiv. 20) does not mean a buying back for money, but an exchanging for an animal that could be used as a sacrifice.

⁸⁵ See in general, Philo, *De praemiis sacerdotum*, sec. i. (Mang. ii. 233). Τρίτον ἐστὶ γέρας τὰ πρωτότοκα ἀρβενικά καὶ πάντα τῶν χειρσαίων ὅσα πρὸς ὑπηρεσίας καὶ χρῆσιν ἀνθρώπων. Ταῦτα γὰρ κελεύει διαδίδοσθαι τοῖς ἱερομένοις ἀνθρώποις. Βοῶν μὲν καὶ προβάτων καὶ αἰγῶν αὐτὰ τὰ ἔκγονα, μόσχους καὶ κριοὺς καὶ χιμάρρους, ἐπειδὴ καθαρὰ καὶ πρὸς ἐδαδὴν καὶ πρὸς θυσίας ἐστὶ τε καὶ νευόμισται· ἵντρα δὲ κατατιθέναι τῶν ἄλλων ἵππων καὶ ὄνων καὶ καμήλων καὶ τῶν παραπλησίων μὴ μειοῦντας τὴν ἀξίαν. Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ταῦτα παμπληθῆ. . . . Τὴν δὲ τῶν πρωτότοκων νῖὸν καθιέρωσιν, ὡς ὑπὲρ τοῦ μήτε γονεῖς τέκνων μήτε τέκνα γονέων διαζεύγνυσθαι, τιμᾶται τὴν ἀπαρχὴν ἀργυρίῳ ῥητῶ, προστάξας ἴσον εἰσφέρειν καὶ πέννητα καὶ πλούσιον. Comp. also *De caritate*, sec. x. (ed. Mang. ii. 391). Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 4. 4: τῶν τετραπύδων δὲ τῶν εἰς τὰς θυσίας νευομισμένων τὸ γεννηθὲν πρῶτον, ἂν ἄρσεν ᾦ, καταθύσαι παρασχεῖν τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν, ὥστε αὐτοὺς πανοικί σιτεῖσθαι ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ πόλει· τῶν δ' οὐ νευομισμένων ἐσθίειν παρ' αὐτοῖς κατὰ τοὺς πατέρας νόμους τοὺς δεσπότας τῶν τικτομένων σίκλον καὶ ἡμισυ αὐτοῖς ἀναφέρειν, ἀνθρώπου δὲ πρωτότοκου πέντε σίκλους. Mishna tractate *Bechoroth*. Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heilighümer*, book iii. chap. xlv. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Erstgeburt." Saalschütz i. 348 f. Haneberg, pp. 569-571. Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese*, etc., 1851, p. 98 f. (on the Sept. rendering of Ex. xiii. 13 and xxxiv. 20). Ritter, *Philo*, pp. 118-122 (the most exhaustive and accurate of any). Knobel-Dillmann, *Exeget. Handbuch*, note on Ex. xiii. 1, 2. Löw, *Die Lebensalter in der jüd. Literatur*, 1875, pp. 110-118, 390-392 (specially treating of the first-born in the case of man).

cheeks, and the stomach. This is the sense in which Deut. xviii. 3 was understood, and was therefore taken as referring, not to animals offered in sacrifice, but to those slaughtered for ordinary use. According to the later interpretation of it, this prescription was also regarded as applying exclusively to such animals as were suitable for sacrifices, viz. oxen, sheep and goats.⁸⁶

(3.) Again, a portion of the *proceeds of the sheep-shearing* had to be given to the priests, only in those cases however in which a person owned more than one sheep—according to the school of Shammai, when he owned two, according to Hillel's school, on the other hand, not unless he owned five. This offering was said to amount to five Jewish (=ten Galilaean) sela.⁸⁷

III. Besides the regular offerings, there also fell to the priests a considerable number of an *irregular* and *extraordinary* character. To this category belonged, fundamentally at least, a large number of sacrifices offered on an almost endless variety of occasions (see p. 195 f. above); but besides

⁸⁶ See in general, besides Deut. xviii. 3, Philo, *De praemiis sacerdotum*, sec. iii. (Mang. ii. 235): 'Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἔξω τοῦ βαροῦ θυομένων ἕνεκα κρεωφαγίας τρία προστίτανται τῷ ἱερεῖ διδοσθαι, βραχίονα καὶ σιαγόνα καὶ τὸ καλούμενον ἡνυστρον. Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 4. 4: εἶναι δὲ καὶ τοῖς κατ' οἶκον θυοῦσιν, εὐωχίας ἕνεκα τῆς αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴ θρησκείας, ἀνάγκη κομιζέειν τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἡνυστρόν τε καὶ χελύνιον καὶ τὸν δεξιὸν βραχίονα τοῦ θύματος. On the meaning of χελύνιον (not the breast, but the cheek), see notes on this passage in Bernard and Havercamp's editions of Josephus. Mishna tractate *Chullin* x. and the corresponding *Gemara*, fol. 130 ff. *Sifra* to Deut. xviii. 3 in Ugolini, vol. xiii. 1113–1115 (here too, as in Josephus, the right foreleg or shoulder). Jerome, *Epist.* lxiv. *ad Fabiolam*, chap. ii. (Vallarsi, i. 355): Caeterum et alia tria, exceptis primitiis hostiarum et de privato et de macello publico, ubi non religio sed victus necessitas est, sacerdotibus membra tribuuntur, brachium, maxilla et venter. Bernard and Havercamp's editions of Josephus, notes on *Antt.* iv. 4. 4. Saalschütz, i. p. 350. Haneberg, p. 576 f. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. xii. p. 181 f. Knobel's note on Deut. xviii. 3. Ritter's *Philo*, p. 124 f. Wellhausen, i. p. 158.

⁸⁷ See in general, Deut. xviii. 4. Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 4. 4: εἶναι δὲ ἀπαρχὰς αὐτοῖς καὶ τῆς τῶν προβάτων κουράς. Mishna, *Chullin* xi. 1, 2. *Sifra* to Deut. xviii. 4, in Ugolini, vol. xiii. p. 1113. Philo, *De caritate*, sec. x. (Mangey, ii. 391), erroneously includes this offering among the tithes.

these they also received the following offerings: (1) *The consecration vows*, or votive offerings. These might be of a very varied character. One could dedicate oneself or some other person to the sanctuary (to the Lord). In such cases it was usual to pay a certain sum of money by way of ransom, viz. fifty shekels for a man and thirty for a woman. But one could also dedicate animals, houses, or lands to the sanctuary. If the animals happened to be such as could be offered in sacrifice, then they had to be given *in natura*. But in the case of unclean animals and in that of houses and lands, a money ransom could be paid as before, though on certain conditions specified in the law.⁸⁸ (2) A special form of consecration vow called the *ban*, i.e. something irredeemably devoted to the sanctuary. Whenever anything was devoted to the sanctuary in this form (as something banned, הָרָם) it fell to it, i.e. to the priests *in natura*, whether it were in the shape of a person, cattle, or lands.⁸⁹ (3) Lastly, in those cases in which any one had appropriated or otherwise unlawfully got possession of anything, and in which it was no longer possible to restore the property to its rightful owner, a certain *indemnity* had to be paid, and this also fell to the priests.⁹⁰ With regard to the two things last mentioned, the

⁸⁸ See in general, Lev. xxvii.; Deut. xxiii. 22-24. Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 4. 4; Matt. xv. 5; Mark vii. 11. Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heiligthümer*, book iii. chap. xlv. Saalschütz, *Das mosaische Recht*, i. 150-153, 358-367. Winer's *Real-wörterb.* art. "Gelubde." Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. iv. pp. 788-790 (art. "Gelubde bei den Hebräern"). Knobel-Dillmann, *Exeget. Handbuch*, notes on Lev. xxvii. Haneberg, *Die religiösen Alterthümer der Bibel*, pp. 370-376. Lightfoot, *Horae hebr.*, note on Matt. xv. 5 (*Opp.* ed. Roterodamens. ii. p. 332 f.). Edzard, *Tractatus Talmudicus*, *Aboda sara* 1710, p. 294 ff. Schoettgen, *Horae hebr.*, Wolf's *Curae phil.* in *Nov. Test.*, and Wetzstein's *Nov. Test.*, the notes of the three last-mentioned writers on Matt. xv. 5; see in general the expositors on Matt. xv. 5 and Mark vii. 11; also "Saat auf Hoffnung," edited by Delitzsch for year 1875, pp. 37-40. On the validity of vows in the case of women, see Num. xxx.; Mishna tractate *Nedarim*.

⁸⁹ See Lev. xxvii. 28; Num. xviii. 14; Ezek. xliv. 29. Saalschütz, i. 368-373. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Bann." Lev. xxvii. 29 is not applicable here. See Knobel-Dillmann's note on this latter passage.

⁹⁰ Num. v. 5-8.

law distinctly states that they were to belong to the *priests* personally, whereas the votive offering, on the other hand, would appear to have been devoted as a rule to purposes connected with the services of the sanctuary generally.⁹¹ At the same time Josephus distinctly affirms that the ransom of fifty or of thirty shekels to be paid in those cases in which any one had devoted him or herself to God formed part of the *priests'* emoluments.⁹² Further, the Rabbinical theologians hold that, besides the *cherem* and the indemnity offering, "the inherited field," consecrated as a votive offering (Lev. xxvii. 16-21), was also to be included among the twenty-four different kinds of offerings that fell to the priests.⁹³

To what extent all the offerings to which we have referred were contributed by the *Jews of the dispersion* as well it is no longer possible to say with any degree of certainty in regard to any one of them in particular.⁹⁴ In any case a large

⁹¹ *Shekalim* iv. 6-8: "When any one consecrates his possessions (נִכְסָיו) . . . and there happen to be cattle amongst them suitable for sacrifice, whether males or females, then, according to Rabbi Eliesar, they are to be sold, the males for burnt-offerings and the females for festive offerings, to those who may be requiring them for such purposes, while the money with the *rest of the property* was to be given to the treasury for the support of the temple (לְבֵדֶק הַבַּיִת). Rabbi Josua says: The males are sacrificed as burnt-offerings, and the females are sold to such as happen to be requiring festive offerings, while, with the money realized from the sale, burnt-offerings are purchased and offered; the residue of the property goes to the treasury for the maintenance of the sanctuary. . . . If any one consecrates his possessions, and there happen to be things amongst them suitable for the altar, such as wine, oil, birds, then, according to Rabbi Eliesar, these are to be sold to those who are requiring offerings of this sort, while the money thus realized is to be spent in procuring burnt-offerings; the residue of the property goes to the treasury for the support of the temple."

⁹² Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 4. 4.

⁹³ Comp. the Rabbinical passages quoted in note 60, above.

⁹⁴ For material bearing upon this, see *Challa* iv. 7, 11; *Jadajim* iv. 3; *Chullin* x. 1 (the three portions allotted to the priests at the slaughtering of an animal to be given beyond Palestine as well). Philo, *De monarchia*, ii. 3 (Mang. ii. 224). *Legat. ad Cajum*, sec. xxiii. 40 (Mang. ii. pp. 568 f., 592). Joseph. *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2-7, xviii. 9. 1. The passages from Philo and Josephus refer mainly, of course, to the *didrachma* tax, but not to that alone; see *Antt.* xviii. 9. 1: τὸ τε δίδραχμον . . . καὶ ὅπως ἄλλαι

number of them was paid by those of the dispersion as well, while the amount derived from all those sources was of so handsome a character that the priests always had a comfortable provision. As little are we any longer in a position always to form anything like a distinct conception of the *mode in which those offerings were paid*. Many of them, such as the challa and the three portions to be given on the occasion of slaughtering an animal, were of such a nature that they did not admit of being kept long. Consequently to carry these and such as these to Jerusalem for the purpose of presenting them there would be simply impossible. At any rate, in all those places in which there happened to be priests, they were given to them directly.⁹⁵ But so far as it was at all practicable, the *administration* of the offerings was centralized in Jerusalem. Thither they were conveyed and handed over to those appointed to receive them, and from thence again they were distributed among the priests.⁹⁶

This central administration on the part of the priests extended to the *tithe* as well, which in point of fact was delivered, not to the Levites, but to the priests, in whose hands the further disposal of it was then left.⁹⁷

ἀναθήματα. Hottinger, *De decimis Judaeorum*, p. 100 ff. (*Exercit.* v.). Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (1851), p. 98 f.

⁹⁵ It is said in *Terumoth* ii. 4 with reference to the *terumah*: “*Wherever there happens to be a priest, there the terumah of the choicest portions is paid to him; but where there is no priest a terumah is to be paid of something that will keep.*” According to *Challa* iv. 8, 9, the Challa, things banned, the first-born, the ransom for first-born sons, the ransom for the first-born of the ass, the shoulder, the cheeks and the stomach (on the occasion of killing an animal for ordinary use), the portion of the fleece at the sheep-shearing, and others, could be given to *any priest* no matter where. Hence it was that the *terumah*, for example, and the *tithe*, and the first-born continued to be exacted even after the destruction of the temple, *Bikkurim* ii. 3; *Shekalim* viii. 8.

⁹⁶ See especially, 2 Chron. xxxi. 11–19; Neh. xii. 44, xiii. 5; Malachi iii. 10. Philo, *De praemiis*, sec. iv. (Mang. ii. 235 f.): Ὅτι καὶ τοῦ μηδέναι τῶν διδόντων ἐνειδίξεν τοῖς λαμβάνουσι, καλεῖται τὰς ἀπαρχὰς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν κομίζεσθαι, πρότερον, εἴτ' ἐνθὺνδε τοὺς ἱερεῖς λαμβάνειν.

⁹⁷ Comp. Joseph. *Vita*, xii. 15; *Antt.* xx. 8, 8, 9, 2. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des*

Nor were those priestly gifts made use of merely by the priests themselves, but the privilege of participating in the enjoyment of them was extended to those connected with them as well. The only things that had to be partaken of exclusively by priests were those known as "most holy" (see p. 236, above). All the others might be enjoyed by the whole of the members of a priest's household—his wife, his daughters and his slaves, with the exception however of hired workmen and daughters married to other than priests. But, in every instance, only those were at liberty to participate who were in a condition of Levitical purity.⁹⁸ With regard to the priests no distinction was made, on this occasion, between those duly qualified to officiate and those debarred from doing so in consequence of some physical defect or infirmity. These latter might be allowed, when the division to which they belonged happened to be serving, to go even the length of participating in the "most holy" things themselves.⁹⁹

All the offerings to which we have hitherto been referring only went to form the personal emoluments of the priests. From these are now further to be distinguished those imposts which were directly intended to defray the expenses connected with public worship. The most important of them was the

Volkes Jisrael, ii. 138 ff. Delitzsch, *Zeitschr. f. luth. Theol.* 1877, p. 448 f. Wellhausen, i. 171 f. Ritter's *Philo und die Halacha*, p. 123 f. In the time of Nehemiah the tithe was paid to the Levites precisely in accordance with what is prescribed in the priest-code, while these in turn handed over only a tenth of the tithe to the temple treasury; at the same time the two things were done under the supervision of the priests (Neh. x. 38, 39). The Mishna would appear to proceed on the assumption that the correct thing was for the priests and the Levites to receive their respective shares directly from the hands of the person paying the tithe (*Maaser sheni* v. 6).

⁹⁸ Lev. xxii. 1–16. Philo, *De monarchia*, lib. ii. secs. xiii.–xv. (ed. Mangey, ii. pp. 230–233). Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 4. 4: πάντων δὲ τῶν τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τελουμένων κοινωνεῖν διέταξε καὶ τοὺς οἰκίας καὶ θυγατέρας καὶ γυναῖκας, ἕξω τῶν ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτημάτων ἐπιφερομένων θυσῶν ταύτας γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ μόνοι δαπανῶσιν οἱ ἄλλοι τῶν ἱερῶν αὐθημερόν. *Terumoth* vi. 2, vii. 2. *Sifra* to Lev. xxii. 10 ff., in Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. xiii. p. 1102 ff.

⁹⁹ Lev. xxi. 22. Philo, *De monarchia*, ii. 13. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 12. 2; *Bell. Jud.* v. 7. *Sebachim* xii. 1; *Menachoth* xiii. 10, *fin.*

half-shekel or *didrachma-tax*.¹⁰⁰ There was no tax of this description anterior to the exile, for down to that period it had been the practice for the kings to provide the public sacrifices at their own expense (Ezek. xlv. 17 ff., xlv. 13-15, according to the Septuagint). It was in existence however as early as the days of Nehemiah, although at that time it amounted only to a third of a shekel (Neh. x. 33, 34). The raising of it to half a shekel cannot have taken place till subsequent to Nehemiah's time. Consequently, the passage in the Pentateuch (Ex. xxx. 11-16), in which the half-shekel tax is prescribed, must be regarded as a later modification of the terms of the priest-code, which moreover is probable for yet other reasons.¹⁰¹ The actual payment of this tax in the time of Christ is placed beyond a doubt by the unquestionable testimony of various authorities.¹⁰² Then again it was one that had to be paid by every male Israelite of twenty years of age or upwards, no matter whether he were rich or poor,¹⁰³ and that, in common with all sacred tribute, in money of the early Hebrew or Tyrian (Phoenician) standard.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁰ Comp. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Abgaben." Saalschütz, i. pp. 291-293. Wieseler's *Chronologische Synopse*, p. 264 ff. Id., *Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien*, p. 108 ff. Huschke, *Ueber den Census und die Steuer-verfassung der früheren römischen Kaiserzeit* (1847), pp. 202-208. Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, ii. 599 ff. Notes of Meyer and other expositors on Matt. xvii. 24.

¹⁰¹ See Wellhausen, *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1877, p. 412. The passage in Exodus itself speaks only of *one special* instance in which the tax was paid, viz. on the occasion of the numbering of the people in the time of Moses (Num. i.). But there cannot be a doubt that this was indirectly intended to furnish a legal basis on which to found the exaction of the regular half-shekel tax. It is also in this sense that the passage has been understood so early as by the author of the Chronicles (2 Chron. xxiv. 4-10).

¹⁰² Matt. xvii. 24; Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 9. 1; *Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 6. Mishna tractate *Shekalim*.

¹⁰³ Ex. xxx. 14, 15. Philo, *De monarchia*, ii. 3 (Mang. ii. 224): Προστέτακται γὰρ αἰνὰ πᾶν ἔτος ἀπαρχὴν εἰσφέρειν ἀπὸ εἰκοσαετοῦς ἀρξαμένους.

¹⁰⁴ Tosefta, *Kethuboth* xii. *fin.*: "Wherever money is mentioned in the law, it is Syrian money (בסוף צורי) that is meant. The specimens of Hebrew shekels that have been preserved are found really to correspond with money of the Phoenician standard. A half-shekel therefore is equal to two

The time for payment was the month Adar (somewhere about the month of March);¹⁰⁵ while the mode of procedure on that occasion was to have the whole of the contributions payable by one community gathered together and then sent on to Jerusalem, there to be duly paid over in name of that community.¹⁰⁶ This tax was spent mainly in defraying the expense of the daily burnt-offering, and of all the sacrifices generally that had to be offered in the name of the people, as well as for other objects of a public character.¹⁰⁷ After the destruction of Jerusalem the didrachma had for a long time to be paid toward the support of the temple of *Jupiter Capitolinus* in Rome.¹⁰⁸ It is true that in the reign of Nerva the *calumnia fisci Judaici* was put an end to, but the tax itself was not repealed.¹⁰⁹

Over and above the half-shekel tax, and as forming a matter of regular tribute for the temple, there was, above all, the *furnishing of so much wood* every year as fuel for the altar

Tyrian drachmae, or to something like 1 mark 31 pfennige of German money. Comp. p. 244, above. In the time of Christ it was only the Roman standard that was in force in Palestine (1 denarius = 1 Attic drachma, both of these being somewhat heavier than the Tyrian drachma). Consequently, in paying the sacred tribute it was very often necessary to have recourse to the exchangers.

¹⁰⁵ *Shekalim* i. 1, 3.

¹⁰⁶ *Shekalim* ii. 1. Comp. Matt. xvii. 24.

¹⁰⁷ Neh. x. 33, 34. *Shekalim* iv. 1-3.

¹⁰⁸ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 6. Dio Cass. lxi. 7. Comp. Sueton. *Domitian*, 12: *Judaicus fiscus acerbissime actus est*.

¹⁰⁹ We have evidence of the first-mentioned fact in the shape of a coin belonging to the reign of Nerva with the words "*fisci Judaici calumnia sublata*" inscribed upon it (Madden's *History of Jewish Coinage*, p. 199). This cannot be taken as alluding to the repeal of the tax itself, but merely to the fact that it was no longer to be imposed in a form so offensive to the Jews, and therefore, of course, that it was no longer to go towards the support of heathen worship. We find that the tax itself was still being paid subsequent to the period here in question; comp. Appian. *Syr.* l., and especially Origen's *Epist. ad African.* sec. xiv. (ed. Lommatsch, xvii. 44): *καὶ νῦν γοῦν Ῥωμαίων βασιλεύοντων, καὶ Ἰουδαίων τὸ διδραχμον αὐτοῖς τελούντων*. The Rabbinical writers again have decided that the payment of the half-shekel tax ceased to be binding when the temple ceased to exist (*Shekalim* viii. 8).

of burnt-offering.¹¹⁰ As early as the time of Nehemiah it was ordained that the priests, the Levites and the people were at certain periods of the year to furnish the necessary supply of wood for the altar, all of them according to the houses of their fathers, their turn being decided by lot (Neh. x. 34, xiii. 31). At a later period the "wood offering" took place, for the most part, on the 15th of the month Ab, a day which, for this very reason, came to acquire a certain festive character.¹¹¹ However, at this same period wood was also furnished by certain families on other days besides the one just mentioned.¹¹²

¹¹⁰ On this see Herzfeld's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, ii. 144 f. Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 3rd ed. iii. pp. 612 (note 1) and 668 (note 14). Derenbourg's *Histoire de la Palestine*, p. 109, note 2. Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. für Bibel und Talmud*, part ii. p. 881 f., art. "Opferholzspende."

¹¹¹ *Megillath Taanith*, sec. xi. (in Derenbourg, pp. 443, 445). Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 6: τῆς τῶν ξυλοφορίων ἡμετέρας οὔσης, ἐν ᾗ πᾶσιν ἔθος ἔλθην τῇ θωμῇ προσφέρειν. Seeing that in *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 7, Josephus designates the day following the delivery of the wood as the fifteenth of lot-casting (=Ab), it would follow from this that the delivery took place on the fourteenth of Ab. But, according to the Rabbinical sources, there can be no doubt whatever that the fifteenth of Ab was the principal day; see *Megillath Taanith*, sec. xi.; *Mishna, Taanith* iv. 5, iv. 8; in general also, *Taanith* iv. 4; *Megilla* i. 3; *Jer. Taanith* 68^b, 69^c; *Megilla* 70^c; *Bab. Taanith* 28a-31a.

¹¹² *Mishna, Taanith* iv. 5: "The dates fixed for the furnishing of the wood on the part of the priests and the people were the following nine days:—

1. On the first of Nisan it was furnished by the family of *Arach* of the tribe of *Judah* (comp. *Ezra* ii. 5; *Neh.* vii. 10).
2. On the twentieth of Tammus by the family of *David* of the tribe of *Judah* (comp. *Ezra* viii. 2).
3. On the fifth of Ab by the family of *Parbosh* of the tribe of *Judah* (comp. *Ezra* ii. 3, viii. 3, x. 25; *Neh.* iii. 25, vii. 8, x. 15).
4. On the seventh of Ab by the family of *Jonadab* the Rechabite (comp. 2 *Kings* x. 15, 23; *Jer.* xxxv. 8; 1 *Chron.* ii. 55).
5. On the tenth of Ab by the family of *Sēnaa* of the tribe of *Benjamin* (comp. *Ezra* ii. 35; *Neh.* iii. 3, vii. 38).
6. On the fifteenth of Ab by the family of *Sattu* of the tribe of *Judah* (comp. *Ezra* ii. 8, x. 27; *Neh.* vii. 13, x. 15).

On this same day by The priests.

The Levites.

Those of unknown descent.

The *Benê Gonbê Eli* and the *Benê Koz'ê Kezi'oth*.

7. On the twentieth of Ab by the family of *Pachath-Moab* of the tribe of *Judah* (comp. *Ezra* ii. 6, viii. 4, x. 30; *Neh.* iii. 11, vii. 11, x. 15).

Every species of wood was allowable except that of the olive and the vine.¹¹³

Then, in the last place, *freewill offerings* formed a copious source of wealth for the temple. We have already stated that probably the largest share of the *vows* did not fall to the priests personally, but was used to defray the expenses incurred in connection with the services of the sanctuary (see p. 247, above). But however this might be, that was certainly the case with regard to those vows that were formed for some particular purpose, as well as those other *voluntary gifts* which did not assume exactly the character of a vow.¹¹⁴ Very often objects were presented that could be turned to account either in connection with the services of the temple or in the way of ornamenting it.¹¹⁵ For example, to mention just a single instance, one could present so much gold in the shape of a few leaves, or grapes, or clusters of grapes, with a view to the enlargement of the golden vine that was placed over the entrance to the temple;¹¹⁶ the wealthy Alabarch Alexander of Alexandria provided the gold and silver with which the gates of the court were covered;¹¹⁷ nor was it uncommon for distinguished Gentiles to present gifts to the temple (on this see close of present paragraph). As a rule, however, the gifts were bestowed in the shape of money, and then even the poor widow's mite was not unwelcome (Mark xii. 41-44; Luke xxi. 1-4). In the treasury of the temple thirteen trumpet-shaped boxes were erected, and into these the money was dropped that was intended for the various purposes connected with the religious services. No fewer than six of those boxes

8. On the twentieth of Elul by the family of *Adin* of the tribe of *Judah* (comp. Ezra ii. 15, viii. 6; Neh. vii. 20, x. 17).

9. On the first of Tebeth by the family of *Parōsh* for the second time."

¹¹³ *Tamid* ii. 3. Otherwise, according to the Book of Jubilees, chap. xxi. (in Ewald's *Jahrb. der. bibl. Wissensch.* iii. 19). *Testam.* xii. *Patriarch. Levi*, chap. ix.

¹¹⁴ That at least a formal distinction was made between *vows* (נדרים) and *freewill offerings* (נדבנות) may be seen from *Megilla* i. 6.

¹¹⁵ See in general, Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* v. 13. 6; Mishna, *Joma* iii. 10.

¹¹⁶ *Middoth* iii. 8, *fin.*

¹¹⁷ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 3.

were for the reception of "voluntary gifts" pure and simple, without the object for which they were intended being further specified; and the whole of these latter were expended, at least so the Mishna affirms, in the purchase of burnt-offerings (just because it was supposed that in these most benefit would, so to speak, accrue to God).¹¹⁸

III. THE VARIOUS FUNCTIONS OF THE PRIESTHOOD.

As the priests were so numerous, their emoluments so plentiful, and their functions so varied, it was necessary that there should also be an extensive apportioning among them of the different departments of the service. As we have already pointed out in a previous section, the whole priesthood was divided into twenty-four families, each of which formed a distinct body, with presidents and elders at its head. But apart from this social organization of the entire order, there was further, the organism of the *special functions* connected with the multifarious services of the sanctuary. Of those special offices there were *two* that (at least during the last century of the temple's existence, to which period the following account is to be understood as applying) were conspicuous above all the others, and to these we will here assign the foremost place.

1. The head of the whole priesthood was the *supreme*, or as we usually designate him, the *high priest*, כהן גדול, ἀρχιερεύς.¹¹⁹ The characteristic feature about the position of this distinguished functionary was the combining in one and the same person of both a *civil* and a *sacred* dignity. Not only was he

¹¹⁸ *Shekalim* vi. 5, 6.

¹¹⁹ Comp. on this functionary, Winer's *Realwörterb.* under word. Oehler's art. "Hoherpriester," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* (1st ed. vol. vi. pp. 198-206, 2nd ed. vi. pp. 237-245, revised by Delitzsch), and the literature quoted in both those works; also Graf's art. "Priester," in Schenkel's *Bibelllex.* Wellhausen's *Gesch. Israels*, i. pp. 153-156. Riehm, *Handwörterb. des bibl. Altertums*, under word.

the supreme religious functionary, the one to whom alone pertained the privilege of performing certain acts of worship of the highest religious significance, such as, above all, the offering of the sacrifice on the great day of atonement, but he was also, at the same time, the supreme civil head of the people, the supreme head of the State, in so far, that is, as the State was not under the sway of foreign rulers. In the days of national independence the hereditary Asmonæan high priests were priests and kings at one and the same time; while, at a later period again, the high priests were, at least the presidents of the Sanhedrim, and even in all political matters, the supreme representatives of the people in their relations with the Romans (for details, see § 23. IV., above). As was to be expected, considering the distinguished social position which he held, the high priest did not officiate except on festival occasions. He was, in fact, legally bound to do so only on the great day of atonement, when he was called upon to offer before the Lord the great sin-offering of the people (Lev. xvi.); though, according to later usage, he was further required to offer the daily sacrifice during the week immediately preceding the great day of atonement.¹²⁰ Otherwise he was left perfectly free to sacrifice only when he felt disposed to do so.¹²¹ According to the testimony of Josephus, he officiated, as a rule, every Sabbath day, and on the occasion of the new moons or other festivals in the course of the year.¹²² We must beware of confounding with the sacrifices just mentioned, and which he offered as representing the people and in their name, the daily meat-offering which he required to offer purely on his own account (Lev. vi. 12–16). But on those latter occasions it was not so much required that he himself should officiate (which he seldom did) as that he

¹²⁰ *Joma* i. 2.

¹²¹ *Joma* i. 2; *Tamid* vii. 3.

¹²² *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 7: ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς ἀνῆκει μὲν σὺν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλ' οὐκ αἰεί, ταῖς ἑβδομάσι καὶ νομηνίαις καὶ εἴ τις ἑορτὴ πάτριος ἢ πανήγυρις πάνδημος ἀγομένη δι' ἔτους. It further appears that the high-priestly functions had been actually discharged by the Asmonæan princes. See Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 10. 3 (John Hyrcanus), xiii. 13. 5 (Alexander Jannæus).

should defray the cost of the offerings.¹²³ The somewhat unique character of the high priest's position found further expression in the special purity and holiness that were expected of him (see pp. 211, 214, above), as well as in the gorgeous official attire which he wore when exercising his sacred functions.¹²⁴ Only at that part of the service on the great day of atonement at which he entered the holy of holies, he wore a simple white dress, which however was made of the most expensive Pelusian and Indian linen (or cotton?).¹²⁵

¹²³ Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 10. 7. For a fuller treatment of the matter, see chap. iv. below.

¹²⁴ The Biblical and post-Biblical sources dwell with peculiar delight upon the splendour of this attire. See Ex. xxviii. and xxix. ; Sirach xlv. 6-13, l. 5 ff. Aristéas, ed. Mor. Schmidt, in *Merx' Archiv*, i. 271. 21-272. 9 (in Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 113). Philo, *Vita Mosis*, iii. 11-14 (ed. Mang. ii. 151-155); *De monarchia*, ii. 5, 6 (ed. Mang. ii. 225-227). Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 7. 4-7, and *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 7. Mishna, *Joma* vii. 5. Jerome's *Epist. ad Fabiolam*, chap. x.-xviii. (ed. Vallarsi, i. 360-366). Among the literature given at the head of this section we would specially refer the reader to Joh. Braun, *Vestitus sacerdotum Hebraeorum*, Amst. 1680. Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heiligh* book iii. chap. iv.-viii. Bened. Dav. Carpzov, *De pontificum Hebraeorum-vestitu sacro* (in Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. xii., *ibid.* in vols. xii. and xiii., and other monographs besides). Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. xiii. pp. 163-434. Bähr's *Symbolik des mos. Cult.* ii. 61-165. Leyrer's art. "Kleider, heilige bei den Hebräern," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. vii. 714-722, and the literature quoted there. Haneberg, *Die relig. Alterthümer der Bibel*, pp. 534-555. De Sauley, *Revue archéologique*, new series, vol. xx. 1869, pp. 91-115. Likewise the literature of the subject of the high priest quoted in note 119. In the library of the University of Giessen there is a very learned work in manuscript by Martinus Mauriti, entitled *De re vestitaria Hebraeorum*, 1685 (*Cod. Gissens.* 593-595). During the Roman period a serious political dispute arose about the custody of the high priest's dress, see Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 11. 4, xviii. 4. 3, xx. 1. 1, 2; further *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1872, pp. 627-630. At the conquest of Jerusalem this splendid attire fell into the hands of the Romans (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 8. 3).

¹²⁵ Lev. xvi. 4. Mishna, *Joma* iii. 7 (on the materials here referred to, comp. note 215, below). Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 7: ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν ἱσθήτα [οὐκ] ἱφόρει τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον, λιτοτέραν δ' ἀνελάμβανεν ὅποτε [δὲ] εἰσίοις εἰς τὸ ἅδυντον. The words within brackets are here to be deleted. The high priest wore the linen dress (בגדי לבן) only when performing those parts of the service that had special reference to the great day of atonement. When performing the others however, he wore his more gorgeous dress (בגדי זהב) on the great day of atonement as well as on any other occasion. For further particulars on this point, see *Joma* iii. 4. 6, vii. 1. 3, 4; comp. besides, Joseph. *Antt.* 4. 3 (when the Romans had the

2. Next to the high priest in point of rank came the כֹּהֵן or כֹּהֵנִי, Aramaic כֹּהֵנִי, regarding whose functions the conceptions of the Rabbinical authorities are anything but clear. They seem to think that he was simply the representative of the high priest, and that his chief function was to act as the substitute of this latter, should he happen to be disqualified for taking part in the worship in consequence of Levitical defilement; and this view has also continued to be the prevailing one among Christian scholars down to the present day.¹²⁶ But it is undoubtedly erroneous. Among all the passages in the Mishna in which the כֹּהֵן is mentioned there is not one that throws any further light whatever upon his official position. All they can be said to tell us is that he stood next to the high priest in point of rank. When the high priest drew the lot, in the case of the two he-goats, on the great day of atonement, the כֹּהֵן stood at his right hand, while the president of the division or course that happened to be serving (ראש בית אב) was at his left.¹²⁷ Again, when he had occasion to read a portion from the Scriptures, the president of the synagogue handed the roll to the כֹּהֵן, who in turn passed it to the high priest.¹²⁸ Also when he happened to offer the daily sacrifice, the כֹּהֵן was still found at his side.¹²⁹ From all this however we are not at liberty to infer that the segan (I

dress in their custody they allowed the Jews to have the use of it *τρίτην ἡμέραν ἐκείνου ἔτους καὶ κατὰ τὴν νηστείαν*, i.e. on the great day of atonement).

¹²⁶ See in general, Buxtorf's *Lex. Chald.* under word כֹּהֵן. Selden, *De successione in pontificatum Ebraeorum*, ii. 1. Lightfoot, *Ministerium templi*, v. 1 (*Opp.* i. 687 f.). Sheringam on *Joma* iii. 9 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. 223). Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, p. 98 f. Vitringa, *Observationes sacrae* (1723), lib. vi. cap. xxiii. pp. 517-531. Blossius, 1711, Overkamp, 1739 (both quoted by Meusel, *Bibliotheca historica*, i. 2. 165). Quandt, *De pontificis maximi suffraganeo* (in Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. xii. pp. 963-1028). Oehler's art. "Hoherpriester," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vi. 204. Haneberg, *Die relig. Alterth. der Bibel*, p. 558 f. Levy, *Chald. Wörtl.* under word כֹּהֵן. Idem, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* under same word. On the כֹּהֵנִים in the Old Testament, consult Gesenius' *Thesaurus*, under word.

¹²⁷ *Joma* iii. 9, iv. 1.

¹²⁸ *Joma* vii. 1; *Sota* vii. 7-8.

¹²⁹ *Tamid* vii. 3.

prefer this Aramaic form because we are unable to say for certain what the Hebrew form of the singular was) was intended to act as the high priest's substitute on those occasions on which he was prevented from officiating himself. Such an inference would be decidedly wrong. For what the Mishna says with regard to this matter of the substitute is rather to this effect: "Seven days before the great day of atonement it is customary to appoint some other priest (כהן אחר) to be ready to take the place of the high priest in the event of any accident happening to the latter calculated to interrupt the service."¹⁸⁰ This would surely have been extremely superfluous if there had been a permanent official whose duty it was to act as the high priest's representative or substitute. It appears to me that we need have no difficulty in arriving at a true and distinct conception as to what was the real position of the segan, if we will only take due note of the way in which the term סגנים is rendered in the Septuagint. For we find that there it is almost invariably represented by στρατηγός.¹⁸¹ Consequently, the סגן can have been no other than the στρατηγός τοῦ ἱεροῦ, the captain of the temple, whom we find frequently mentioned in the Greek sources, both in Josephus and the New Testament.¹⁸² To this functionary was entrusted the chief superintendence of the arrangements for preserving order in and around the temple. And so when we consider the very important nature of this

¹⁸⁰ Joma i. 1.

¹⁸¹ So Jer. li. 23, 28, 57; Ezek. xxiii. 6, 12, 23; Ezra ix. 2 (Vulgate omits it); Neh. ii. 16, iv. 8, xii. 40, xiii. 11; Dan. iii. 2, 27, vi. 8. In a very few instances we have ἀρχοντες, Isa. xli. 25; Neh. iv. 13, v. 7, vii. 5; and, on one solitary occasion, σατράπαι, Dan. ii. 48.

¹⁸² Acts iv. 1: ὁ στρατηγός τοῦ ἱεροῦ. Similarly Acts v. 24, 26. Josephus, Antt. xx. 6. 2: Ἀνανίαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ τὸν στρατηγὸν Ἀνανον. Bell. Jud. vi. 5. 3: οἱ τοῦ ἱεροῦ φύλακες ἡγγεῖλαν τῷ στρατηγῷ. Antt. xx. 9. 3: τὸν γραμματέα τοῦ στρατηγοῦντος Ἐλεάζαρου. Bell. Jud. ii. 17. 2: Ἐλεάζαρος υἱὸς Ἀνανίου τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, νεανίας θρασύτατος, στρατηγῶν τότε. It is quite possible that, in several of the last-mentioned passages, instead of its being the chief στρατηγός that was meant, it was rather one of the subordinate στρατηγοί who were also among the temple officials, as will be pointed out immediately.

office, we can quite easily understand how the priest who had the honour to hold it should have been regarded as second only to the high priest himself.

Besides the *segan* or *στρατηγός* in the singular, we also meet with the plural form *סגנים* or *στρατηγοί*. When the festive processions of the country people went up to Jerusalem with the first-fruits, it was usual for the foremost among the priests to go out to meet them, namely the *פָּחוֹת* and *סִגְנִים* and *נְבָרִים*.¹³³ The two first of those categories, the *פָּחוֹת* and the *סִגְנִים*, correspond to the *οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ στρατηγοί* of Luke xxii. 4, 52.¹³⁴ What we are to understand by the *ἀρχιερεῖς* has been already pointed out at p. 201 ff. above. But the *סגנים* or *στρατηγοί* are in any case, so far as the nature of their office is concerned, of the same order as the *סֵנ* or *στρατηγός*, only holding a somewhat lower rank, and therefore captains of the temple police as much as, though subordinate to, the chief *στρατηγός*.^{134a}

In the lists of the priests that are given in several passages in the Talmud those who rank next to the *high priest* and the *segan* are the *presidents* of the courses of service, those at the head of the twenty-four leading divisions (*ראש המשמר*) being mentioned first, and those at the head of the sub-divisions (*ראש בית אב*) coming next.¹³⁵ The functions of those presidents had however no immediate reference to the worship, but to the priesthood as a corporate body, in which aspect we

¹³³ *Bikkurim* iii. 3.

¹³⁴ The *פָּחוֹת* and *סִגְנִים* are also frequently conjoined in this way in the Old Testament (Jer. li. 23, 28, 57; Ezek. xxiii. 6, 12, 23). In such cases the Septuagint rendering is, as a rule, *ἡγεμόνες* (or *ἡγούμενοι*) καὶ στρατηγοί, in one instance (Jer. li. 57) it is *ἄρχοντες καὶ στρατηγοί*. Consequently in the passage quoted from the Mishna, viz. *Bikkurim* iii. 3, as above, in which it is priests that are in question, the *פָּחוֹת* can scarcely be other than the *ἀρχιερεῖς*, for the *ἄρχοντες* among the priests are simply the *ἀρχιερεῖς*. This is corroborated by the form of expression made use of by Luke.

^{134a} Possibly the *סֵנ הכהנים*, R. Chananiah, so frequently mentioned in the Mishna, was a *סֵנ* of this sort. On this personage, see § 25. IV.

¹³⁵ See especially, *Tosefta Horajoth, fin.* (ed. Zuckerman, p. 476); *Jer. Horajoth* 48b, in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xiii. p. 870.

have already had occasion to speak of them at p. 220 f. The sacred functions, properly so called, which still fall to be mentioned here besides those of the high priest and the segan, are those that related partly to the *administration of the possessions and stores belonging to the sanctuary*, partly to the *superintendence of the temple police*, and partly to the religious services themselves. All that we know with respect to those three categories is substantially as follows.¹³⁶

I. A very important function was that of the administration of the vast amount of property belonging to the temple. The store-chambers of the sanctuary were filled with possessions of multifarious kinds piled in masses one upon another. First there were the *utensils* employed in the sacrificial worship, which of themselves represented a handsome sum, and consisting of a whole host of gold and silver basins, cups, pots and articles of a like kind used for such purposes as catching up and sprinkling the blood, for offering the frankincense and the meat- and drink-offerings, etc.¹³⁷ Again there were large quantities of curtains, and priests' garments, and of the materials required for making them.¹³⁸ And there were, in particular, vast collections of natural products, viz.: flour and oil for the meat-offerings, wine for the drink-offerings, fragrant substances with which to make the frankincense, and in addition to these things, the offerings contributed for the benefit of the priests.¹³⁹ But, above all, there were also the

¹³⁶ Comp. Lightfoot, *Ministerium templi*, cap. v. and vii. Herzfeld's *Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael*, i. 387-424. Haneberg, *Die relig. Alterth.* p. 555 ff. Graf in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 226-232. Also in general the literature of the subject of the *Levites* as quoted in note 43 above.

¹³⁷ See in general, Ezra i. 9-11, viii. 26, 27; 1 Macc. i. 21-23; Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 6, v. 13. 6, vi. 5. 2, vi. 8. 3; *Joma* iii. 10, iv. 4. According to *Tamid* iii. 4, ninety-three gold and silver utensils were required for the daily service; while, according to *Chagiga* iii. 8, three sets of each were kept. For a few particulars, see Ex. xxv. 29, 38, xxvii. 3, xxxvii. 16, 23, xxxviii. 3; Num. iv. 7, 9, 14.

¹³⁸ *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 2, vi. 8. 3.

¹³⁹ Neh. xii. 44, xiii. 5, 9, 12; 1 Chron. ix. 20; *Bell. Jud.* v. 13, 6, vi. 8. 3; *Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 6.

large sums of money that were deposited in the store-houses of the temple, and which were of such a colossal character that they not unfrequently tempted greedy foreign potentates to plunder them, and yet it would appear that they were always speedily replaced.¹⁴⁰ Then, in the last place, there fall to be added to the heaps of money stored in the temple the various sums deposited there by private individuals; for it was quite common to lodge such deposits in the temple from a feeling that the sacredness of the place afforded the best possible guarantee for their security.¹⁴¹ All the money and the various articles of value were kept in separate repositories (*γαζοφυλάκια*) in the inner court of the temple, and not only did they require to be constantly watched, but in consequence of the receiving on the one hand and giving out on the other that were continually going on, it was necessary that they should be under careful administration.¹⁴²

The *treasurers*, to whom the administration in question was entrusted, were called *γαζοφύλακες* in Greek¹⁴³ and תְּשֻׁבָּתִים in

¹⁴⁰ Attempt to plunder by *Heliodorus* (2 Macc. iii.); by *Antiochus Epiphanes* (1 Macc. i. 21–23). *Pompey* leaves the treasury intact (*Antt.* xiv. 4. 4; *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 6); *Crassus* plunders it (*Antt.* xiv. 7. 1; *Bell. Jud.* i. 8. 8, carrying off 2000 talents); so also *Sabinus*, after the death of *Herod* (*Antt.* xvii. 10. 2, *fin.*; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 3. 3, *fin.*); *Pilate* (*Antt.* xviii. 3. 2; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 4); *Florus* (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 6). Comp. besides, on the *ισρὸς*; *θησαυρὸς* in general, *Matt.* xxvii. 6; *Joseph. Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 1; *Antt.* xx. 9. 7.

¹⁴¹ 2 Macc. iii. 10–12, 15. *Joseph. Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 2. This was often done in the case of heathen temples as well. See in general, *Winer's Realwörterb.*, art. “Hinterlage.” *Grimm, Exeget. Handb. zu den Apokryphen*, note on 2 Macc. iii. 10. *Marquardt, Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. iii. (1878) p. 210. *Hermann and Blumner, Lehrb. der griechischen Privatalterthümer* (1882), p. 456 f.

¹⁴² On the *γαζοφυλάκια*, see especially, *Joseph. Bell. Jud.* v. 2, *fin.*, vi. 5. 2; *Antt.* xix. 6. 1; *Neh.* xii. 44, xiii. 5, 9, 12, 13. By the *γαζοφυλάκιον* mentioned in the New Testament we are not to understand a *treasure chamber* but a *treasury box* (*Mark* xii. 41, 43; *Luke* xii. 1; probably also *John* viii. 20). According to *Shekalim* vi. 5, there were in the temple thirteen money chests made in the form of trumpets.

¹⁴³ *Antt.* xv. 11. 4, xviii. 4. 3 (the *γαζοφύλακες* had the custody of the high priest's dress). *Antt.* xx. 8. 11: Ἰσμάηλον τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ Ἑλκίαν τὸν γαζοφύλακα (sent on an embassy to Rome). *Bell. Jud.* vi. 8. 8:

Hebrew.¹⁴⁴ Nor were the functions of those officials confined merely to the money in the temple, but extended to the administration of all the possessions generally, that fell under any of the categories just mentioned. They had the custody of the sacred utensils,¹⁴⁵ the veils, and the priests' garments;¹⁴⁶ they took charge of the flour for the meat-offerings and of the wine for the drink-offerings;¹⁴⁷ it was their duty to take delivery of things consecrated (or things presented to the temple), or to return them again on the ransom being duly paid;¹⁴⁸ and they also purchased wood¹⁴⁹ and gathered in the half-shekel tax.¹⁵⁰ Of course among the treasurers too there were once more gradations of rank. According to the statements of the Old Testament, it would seem as though the whole of those offices had been in the hands of the Levites.¹⁵¹ This may have been actually the case so far as the more subordinate duties were concerned, but there can be no doubt whatever that the more important ones were in the hands of the priests. The fact is there is mention in Josephus of a particular occasion on which the γαζοφύλαξ (perhaps the chief one of his class) is put immediately on a level with the high priest, from his being regarded as one of the most distinguished of the temple officials.¹⁵² We also find that elsewhere the מְרִיבֵי are reckoned among the higher functionaries of the ὁ γαζοφύλαξ τοῦ ἱεροῦ Φινέας (surrenders the priests' garments to the Romans). Comp. also *Antt.* xiv. 7. 1: ὁ τῶν θησαυρῶν φύλαξ ἱερεὺς, Ἐλεάζαρος ὄνομα . . . πεπιστευμένος τὴν τῶν καταπετασμάτων τοῦ ναοῦ φυλακὴν (in the time of Crassus).

¹⁴⁴ *Pea* i. 6, *fin.*, ii. 8, *fin.*, iv. 8; *Challa* iii. 3-4; *Bikkurim* iii. 3; *Shekalim* ii. 1, v. 2, 6; *Menachoth* viii. 2, 7; *Meila* iii. 8. The term occurs in the Old Testament likewise, *Ezra* i. 8, vii. 21. Comp. further, *Levy*, *Chald. Wörterb.* under word. Idem, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* under word.

¹⁴⁵ *Shekalim* v. 6; 1 *Chron.* ix. 28.

¹⁴⁶ *Joseph. Antt.* xiv. 7. 1, xv. 11. 4; xviii. 4. 3; *Bell. Jud.* vi. 8. 3.

¹⁴⁷ *Menachoth* viii. 2, 7

¹⁴⁸ *Pea* i. 6, *fin.*, ii. 8, *fin.*, iv. 8; *Challa* iii. 3-4.

¹⁴⁹ *Meila* iii. 8.

¹⁵⁰ *Shekalim* ii. 1.

¹⁵¹ 1 *Chron.* ix. 28, 29, xxvi. 20-28; 2 *Chron.* xxxi. 11-19. The prediction of the author of Chronicles for the Levites is well known. Yet in *Neh.* xiii. 13 it is a *priest* that is found at the head of the treasurers.

¹⁵² *Antt.* xx. 8. 11; see note 143, above.

temple.¹⁵³ When the Mishna affirms that there must have been at least three *נוֹבְרִים* in the temple,¹⁵⁴ it is certain that it can have had in view only the head treasurers and not the entire staff of officials that were required for the administration of the treasury.

It is probable that, under the category of treasury officials, we should also include the *amarkelin* (אֶמְרָכֶלִין), who are mentioned once in the Mishna without any hint whatever being given as to the nature of their functions,¹⁵⁵ the consequence being that the Rabbinical writers indulge merely in empty conjectures on the point, conjectures based, to some extent, upon trivial etymological conceits.¹⁵⁶ The term itself is of Persian origin, and means a "member of the chamber of accounts, or an accountant."¹⁵⁷ Consequently in the Targum of Jonathan we find that in 2 Kings xii. 10 and xxii. 4, for example, the term אֶמְרָכֶלִיא is substituted for the Hebrew expression שְׁמֵרֵי הַפֶּתַח, "keepers of the threshold," by whom the priestly treasurers are meant. We have a term in every way identical with the one now in question in the Armenian expression *hamarakar*, which in like manner denotes an official having charge of the accounts (a chief

¹⁵³ *Bikkurim* iii. 3 (see p. 259, above); also in the lists of the various ranks of the priests given in *Tosefta*, *Horajoth*, *fin.* (see note 135), the *נוֹבְרִים* take precedence of the ordinary priests, while these latter again rank higher than the Levites. In a certain Rabbinical lamentation over the degeneracy of the high priests, the *נוֹבְרִים* are put immediately on a level with them precisely as in Josephus ("They are high priests and their sons are *נוֹבְרִין*, and their sons-in-law *אֶמְרָכֶלִין*." *Tosefta*, *Menachoth*, *fin.*; *Bab. Pesachim* 57^a. Derenbourg, *Histoire*, p. 232, note).

¹⁵⁴ *Shekalim* v. 2.

¹⁵⁵ *Shekalim* v. 2.

¹⁵⁶ In the *Tosefta*, *Shekalim* ii. 15 (ed. Zuckermann, p. 177), it is affirmed that they kept the seven keys of the seven gates of the court (see also Grätz, *Monatsschrift*, 1876, p. 441). But this is a pure conjecture founded upon a statement in the Mishna to the effect that there must have been at least seven *amarkelin*. An attempt is made to explain the term etymologically by supposing it to be derived either from מֶלֶךְ כָּל (lord of all), or אֶמֶר כָּל (he who speaks all, i.e. he who is entitled to order everything). See in general, Levy's *Chald. Wörterb. s.v.* Idem, *Neuhebr. Wörterb. s.v.* אֶמְרָכֶל and מֶרְכֶּל.

¹⁵⁷ Perles, *Etymologische Studien* (1871), p. 106. Comp. Nöldeke, *Göttinger gel. Anzeigen* (1871), 149. Idem, *Literar. Centralbl.* 1875, p. 876.

treasurer).¹⁵⁸ It is true no doubt that our term also occurs elsewhere in the Targums in the more comprehensive sense of chiefs or heads generally.¹⁵⁹ But seeing that, as a rule, the priestly *אמרכלין* are mentioned along with the *נוברין*,¹⁶⁰ we may venture to regard it as certain that they also belonged to the same category as the treasurers. It is possible that they were among the subordinate officials of this department;¹⁶¹ but perhaps the distinction between the *gisbarim* and the *amar-kelin* was something like this, that while to the former was assigned the duty of receiving and taking charge of the various treasures, the latter, on the other hand, were entrusted with the task of distributing among the priests the gifts and offerings that were intended for them.¹⁶² Besides the two classes just mentioned, the Jerusalem Talmud mentions yet a third, viz. the *קתולקין* (*καθολικοί*), of whom however the Mishna knows nothing whatever.¹⁶³

II. For the duties connected with the *police* department,

¹⁵⁸ Prud'homme (*Journal Asiatique*, 16th series, vol. vii. 1866, p. 115) renders it by *comptable ou caissier chef*. Comp. also Levy in Geiger's *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, v. 1867, p. 214 f. Lagarde, *Armenische Studien* (*Abhandlungen der Gottinger Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* vol. xxii. 1877), No. 1216.

¹⁵⁹ Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.*, and Levy, *Chald. Wörterb.* under word.

¹⁶⁰ Besides *Shekalim* v. 2, so also in the list of the ranks of the priests, *Tosefta Horajoth*, fin., and in the lamentation of *Tosefta Menachoth*, fin. (see note 153, above).

¹⁶¹ It is true that, in the list of the grades of the priests *Tosefta Horajoth*, fin., the *אמרכלין* rank higher than the *נוברין*. But this can hardly be correct. See, on the other hand, *Shekalim* v. 2; *Tosefta Menachoth*, fin. In *Bikkurim* iii. 3, the *נוברין* are included among the prominent members of the priesthood, while the *אמרכלין* again are not mentioned at all.

¹⁶² In Chronicles (2 Chron. xxxi. 11-19) those officials whose duty it was to receive the gifts for the priests are plainly distinguished from those who were called upon to distribute them. And now we find it stated in the Mishna, *Shekalim* v. 2, that "it is usual to appoint not fewer than three *gisbarim*, and not fewer than seven *amar-kelim*." If with this we compare what is said about the gathering in and distributing of the money for the poor (*Pea* viii. 7: "Two take charge of the collecting and three of the distributing of it"), it is not unnatural to suppose that the *gisbarim* and the *amar-kelim* would stand to each other precisely in the same relation as that in which the collectors of the money for the poor stood to the distributors of it.

¹⁶³ *Jer. Shekalim* v. fol. 49a.

for which a very large staff of officials was required, it was mostly Levites that were employed. In early times indeed, and down even to the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, the "gate-keepers" (שַׁעְרִים) did not belong as yet to the order of the Levites, but were of a somewhat lower rank; it was the author of the Chronicles who was the first to include these officials also among the number of the Levites (see p. 224, above). In the inner court the duty of keeping watch and ward was discharged by the priests themselves. The author of the Chronicles, and subsequently Philo and the Mishna, have furnished us with several details regarding the organization of the department now in question.¹⁶⁴ We learn from the first-mentioned authority that there were twenty-four wards in all, under four chiefs or captains, and that they were posted on the east, west, north and south sides of the temple (1 Chron. xxvi. 12-18, also ix. 17, 24-27). The statements of this writer are to be understood as applying to the temple of Zerubbabel. But the area of the temple esplanade, or the so-called outer court, was afterwards very much enlarged, especially by Herod, so that it now formed a large quadrangle, its longer side being that which extended from north to south. Within this large square again there was an oblong quadrangular space enclosed by strong walls, the longer side, in this instance, running from west to east; this was the so-called inner court, or "the court" in the strict sense of the word. This court was approached by a flight of steps, and at the foot of this stair was a railing within which no Gentile was allowed to pass. Any Gentile who ventured to pass this boundary and set foot within the inner court was punished with death; and the Roman authorities respected the scruples of the Jews in regard to this matter to such an extent that they sanctioned the execution of this sentence even in those

¹⁶⁴ See in general, Opii Commentarius de custodia templi nocturna (Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. ix. pp. 979-1076). Winer's *Realwörterb.* ii. 590 f. Kneucker's art. "Tempelpolizei," in Schenkel's *Bibellez.* vol. v. p. 484 ff.

cases in which Roman citizens had been the offenders.¹⁶⁵ To this railing notices were attached at certain distances from each other, with the prohibition and the penalty for infringing it inscribed upon them in Greek and Latin.¹⁶⁶ According to Philo, there were keepers in his day not only at the entrances to the inner court, but likewise at the gates of the outer one as well, one of their principal duties being to see that the prohibition in question was rigidly complied with. In addition to these there were watchmen patrolling all round by night and by day to make sure that nothing of an unseemly character was going on anywhere.¹⁶⁷ According to the Mishna, there were twenty-one points at which the Levites kept watch (at night), and three at which the priests did so. The Levitical keepers were stationed partly at the gates and the corners of the outer court (inside of it), and partly at the gates and corners of the inner court (outside of it), while the priestly guards again had charge of the inner court.¹⁶⁸ It was usual

¹⁶⁵ See in general, Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 11. 5; *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 2, vi. 2. 4; *Apion.* ii. 8. Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 31 (ed. Mang. ii. 577). Mishna, *Middoth* ii. 3; *Kelim* i. 8. It was in consequence of an alleged violation of this prohibition on the part of the Apostle Paul, by taking Trophimus into the inner court, that the popular tumult arose that led to the apostle's being arrested (Acts xxi. 28). For the judicial proceedings in such cases, comp. further p. 188, above.

¹⁶⁶ One of those inscriptions was discovered and published in the year 1871 by Clermont-Ganneau. For an account of it, see Clermont-Ganneau, *Revue archéologique*, new series, vol. xxiii. 1872, pp. 214-234, 290-296, pl. x. Derenbourg, *Journal asiatique*, 6th series, vol. xx. 1872, pp. 178-195. Piper, *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1376, p. 51 f. The inscription runs thus:—

ΜΗΘΕΝΑ ΑΛΛΟΓΕΝΗ ΕΙΣΠΙΟ
 ΠΕΤΕΣΘΑΙ ΕΝΤΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΠΕ
 ΡΙ ΤΟ ΙΕΡΟΝ ΤΡΥΦΑΚΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ
 ΠΕΡΙΒΟΛΟΥ ΟΣ Δ ΑΝ ΔΗ
 ΦΘΗ ΕΑΥΤΩΙ ΑΙΤΙΟΣ ΕΣ
 ΤΑΙ ΔΙΑ ΤΟ ΕΞΑΚΟΛΟΥ
 ΘΕΙΝ ΘΑΝΑΤΟΝ.

¹⁶⁷ Philo, *De praemiis sacerdotum*, sec. vi. (ed. Mang. ii. 236): Τούτων οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ θύραις ἵδρυνται παρ' αὐταῖς ταῖς εἰσοδοῖς πυλῶροι· οἱ δὲ εἴσω κατὰ τὸ πρόναον ὑπὲρ τοῦ μή τινα ἂν οὐ θέμις ἐκόντα ἢ ἄκοντα ἐπιβῆναι· οἱ δὲ ἐν κύκλῳ περινοστοῦσιν, ἐν μέρει διακληρωσάμενοι νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν, ἡμεροφύλακες καὶ νυκτοφύλακες.

¹⁶⁸ *Middoth* i. 1; *Tamid* i. 1.

for a captain of the temple to go round at night to see that the guards were not sleeping at their posts.¹⁶⁹ This captain was known under the designation of *אִישׁ הַר הַבֵּית*. Besides this official, there is also occasional mention of an *אִישׁ הַבִּירָה*.¹⁷⁰ Now, seeing that the Mishna knows of no other designation for the whole space around the temple—even in cases where it is to be distinguished from the inner court—but the expression *הַר הַבֵּית*,¹⁷¹ we are accordingly to understand by the *אִישׁ הַר הַבֵּית*, a captain who had charge of the outer court, and by the *אִישׁ הַבִּירָה*, on the other hand, the one who had the surveillance of the temple itself. For the *בִּירָה* cannot possibly have been intended to refer to Fort Antonia, seeing that this latter was under the charge of a Roman *φρούραρχος*,¹⁷² but only to the temple itself.¹⁷³ The two kinds of officials now mentioned would therefore be identical with the *סננים* or *στρατηγοί* to whom we have already had occasion to refer.

It was also part of the watchmen's duty to open and close the whole of the gates of the courts, all of which were shut during the night; and accordingly there was also an officer appointed whose special duty it was to superintend "the shutting of the gates."¹⁷⁴ According to Josephus, the services of two hundred men were required every time the gates were shut,¹⁷⁵ and the heavy brazen gate in the east of the court took twenty men itself.¹⁷⁶ Then as for the gate of the temple, we are told that when it was opened, so loud was the creaking, that it could be heard as far away as Jericho.¹⁷⁷ The keys of the gates of the court were kept by the elders of the particular division of priests whose turn it was to be on watch duty within the court for the time being.¹⁷⁸ When the

¹⁶⁹ *Middoth* i. 2.

¹⁷⁰ *Orla* ii. 12.

¹⁷¹ For example, *Bikkurim* iii. 4; *Pesachim* v. 5-10; *Shekalim* vii. 2-3. *Sanhedrin* xi. 2.

¹⁷² Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 11. 4, xviii. 4. 3.

¹⁷³ So also 1 Chron. xxix. 1, 19. *Pesachim* iii. 8, vii. 8; *Sebachim* xii. 5; *Tamid* i. 1; *Middoth* i. 9; *Para* iii. 1.

¹⁷⁴ *Shekalim* v. 1.

¹⁷⁵ *Contra Apion.* ii. 9.

¹⁷⁶ *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 3.

¹⁷⁷ *Tamid* iii. 8.

¹⁷⁸ *Middoth* i. 8-9; *Tamid* i. 1.

divisions were changed, the one that retired handed them over to the one that came in to take its place.¹⁷⁹ The morning sacrifice, as we know, required to be offered at daybreak, and that being the case the gates would of course have to be open some little time before; while at the Passover season they were open even so early as midnight.¹⁸⁰

III. It is true the *acts of worship properly so called*, i.e. the offering of the sacrifices with all the accompanying ceremonial, devolved as a whole upon the entire priesthood, who were divided into twenty-four courses, each of which conducted the worship by turns, and that for a week at a time (on this see next paragraph). Yet even here *special stated* officials were also necessary for certain particular functions. We get some idea of the multifarious nature of those functions from a passage in the Mishna in which are enumerated, though in a very confused and unsystematic order, the names of those persons who at a particular period (evidently in the closing years of the temple's existence) happened to fill the most important offices in connection with the worship of the sanctuary.¹⁸¹ From that passage it will be seen that there was, for example,

¹⁷⁹ *Contra Apion.* ii. 8.

¹⁸⁰ *Antt.* xviii. 2. 2. Also, in the time of Pentecost, the priests who were to officiate entered the court as early as during the night. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 3. Comp. further, *Joma* i. 8.

¹⁸¹ *Shekalim* v. 1: "The following are the officials who held appointments in the sanctuary: (1) Jochanan the son of Pinchas had charge of the seals; (2) Achiah of the drink-offerings; (3) Matthiah the son of Samuel of the lots; (4) Petachiah of the money for the purchase of birds for sacrifice; (5) Ben Achiah of the healing of the priests suffering from abdominal disorders; (6) Nechoniah was master of the wells; (7) Gebini a herald; (8) Ben Gabar a chief door-shutter; (9) Ben Bebai had charge of the scourging (? *עָרַפּ*, the meaning of which is uncertain); (10) Ben Arsa kept the warning cymbal; (11) Hygros, son of Levi, was conductor of the psalmody; (12) the family of Garmu had the charge of the preparing of the shewbread; (13) the family of Abtinah that of the preparation of the frankincense; (14) Eleazar had the renewing (or the custody?) of the veils; (15) Pinchas that of the garments." As elucidating the whole passage, comp. the Rabbinical commentaries in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. p. 192; and especially, Herzfeld's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, i. p. 405 ff.; also Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums*, i. p. 151 f.

a special official "over the lots" (No. 3), on whom devolved the duty of superintending the daily casting of the lots for determining the particular parts of the service that were to be apportioned to the various officiating priests.¹⁸³ Then there was another functionary who was "over the seals" (No. 1), and another again "over the drink-offerings" (No. 2). For, with a view to simplifying matters, an arrangement had been adopted according to which "seals" or tokens were issued corresponding to the various kinds of drink-offerings, on presenting which people could get the particular drink-offering indicated upon them. The mode of proceeding was first of all to purchase a token from the official who was "over the seals," then to hand this to the one who was "over the drink-offerings," who in return would give to the person tendering it the amount of drink-offering requisite for the particular occasion for which it was wanted.¹⁸³ There was a similar arrangement for the convenience of those who wished to be promptly supplied with birds for sacrificial purposes. All that was necessary was to drop the money into a box, whereupon it became the duty of the official who was "over the winged sacrifices" (No. 4) duly to purchase with it, as speedily as possible, the requisite offerings.¹⁸⁴ Many of the offerings were of such a nature that they required a certain amount of skill to prepare them properly, a skill which belonged by inheritance to particular families. Accordingly the family of Garmu (No. 12) had charge of the preparing of the shewbread, that of Abtinas (No. 13) had the preparing of the frankincense.¹⁸⁵ Then again the chief charge of the psalmody

¹⁸³ On the casting of the lots here in question, see *Joma* ii. 2-4; *Tamid* i. 2, iii. 1, v. 2. The Matthiah, a son of Samuel, who is mentioned as having had charge of the lots, is also mentioned in *Joma* iii. 1, *Tamid* iii. 2, where he is introduced as vouching for the existence of certain practices in the temple.

¹⁸³ *Shekalim* v. 3-5.

¹⁸⁴ The money was dropped into one of the thirteen trumpet-shaped boxes that stood in the temple; see note 142, above.

¹⁸⁵ In *Joma* iii. 11, both families are censured for having allowed strangers to meddle with their art. There was a chamber in the inner court that was

was entrusted to an official specially appointed for the purpose (No. 11).¹⁸⁶ There was another whose duty it was to sound a cymbal (צלצל) by way of letting the Levites know when to commence the music (No. 10).¹⁸⁷ There were besides a temple physician (No. 5), a master of the wells (No. 6), a herald (No. 7), whose voice was so powerful that it could be heard as far away as Jericho.¹⁸⁸ Then further, as the veils in the temple required to be frequently renewed,¹⁸⁹ there was an official appointed to see to the making of them, and to take charge of the store in which they were kept (No. 14). And lastly, there was an official whose special duty it was to take charge of the priests' garments (No. 15).¹⁹⁰

A very numerous class of functionaries connected with the worship of the sanctuary was that of the *sacred musicians*, whose duty it was to accompany the offering of the "daily burnt-offering" and the other solemn services with singing and playing upon stringed instruments,¹⁹¹ and who were called in Hebrew מְשִׁירִים (frequently so in Ezra and Nehemiah), and in Greek, ψαλτωδοί, ἱεροψάλται, ὑμνωδοί, καθαρισταί τε καὶ

named בית אבטינס after the family of Abtinus (*Joma* i. 5; *Tamid* i. 1; *Middoth* i. 1). In addition, comp. in general, 1 Chron. ix. 30-32, xxiii. 29.

¹⁸⁶ On this official, comp. further, *Joma* iii. 11.

¹⁸⁷ Comp. *Tamid* vii. 3.

¹⁸⁸ *Tamid* iii. 8.

¹⁸⁹ *Shekalim* viii. 5.

¹⁹⁰ For the priests' official garments were kept in the court (*Ezek.* xlii. 14). The master of the wardrobe, Pinchas, is likewise mentioned in *Middoth* i. 4; *Joseph. Bell. Jud.* vi. 8. 3. Whether his duty was simply to take charge of the garments, or whether he had also, when necessary, to provide new ones, is not quite clear.

¹⁹¹ On these officials and the temple music generally, compare, in addition to the literature quoted in notes 43 and 136, Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, pp. 698, 844, 1167. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Musik" and "Musikalische Instrumente." Leyrer's art. "Musik bei den Hebräern," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* (1st ed. vol. x. pp. 123-135; 2nd ed. vol. x. pp. 387-398). Wetzstein in Delitzsch's *Commentar zu Jesaja*, 2nd ed. pp. 702-704. Riehm's *Handwörterb. des bibl. Altertums*, pp. 1028-1045 (with numerous illustrations). Grätz, *Die Tempelsalmen* (*Monatsschr.* 1878, pp. 217-222). Idem, *Die musikalischen Instrumente im jerusalemischen Tempel und der musikalische Chor der Leviten* (*Monatsschr.* 1881, pp. 241-259). Lagarde, *Erklärung hebräischer Wörter* (*Abhandlungen der Göttinger Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* vol. xxvi. 1880), pp. 13-27. Stainer, *The Music of the Bible*, London (without a date, 1879?); with 100 illustrations.

ὕμνωδοι.¹⁹² They formed a separate and exclusive order, to which none were admitted but those descended from a particular family, and down even to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah they were distinguished from the Levites, although at a subsequent period they were included amongst them (see above, p. 225 f.).¹⁹³ They were divided into *three families*, those of *Heman*, *Asaph* and *Ethan* or *Jeduthun* (1 Chron. vi. 16–32, xv. 16–19, xxv. the entire chapter; 2 Chron. v. 12),¹⁹⁴ and the whole were sub-divided again into twenty-four courses of service (1 Chron. xxv.). The principal part of their duty was to sing, playing on an instrument being regarded merely in the light of an accompaniment to the singing. The musical instruments made use of for this purpose were chiefly the *three* following:¹⁹⁵—(1) The *cymbal* (מִצְבָּלָה, κύμβαλα), an instrument played by striking the one plate upon the other, and resembling the warning cymbal (צִלְצֵל), with which the signal was given for commencing the singing.¹⁹⁶ As the dual form already serves to indicate, this

¹⁹² ψαλτφοδοί or, according to another reading, ψαλμοδοί, Sir. xlvii. 9, l. 18. ἱεροψάλλται, Joseph. Antt. xii. 3. 3, *fin.*; ὕμνωδοί, Antt. xx. 9. 6; κιθαρισταί τε καὶ ὕμνωδοί, Bell. Jud. ii. 15. 4. From this latter passage we must beware of inferring that the players on the instruments and the singers represent separate categories. For the truth is, both alike come μετὰ τῶν ὀργάνων. "Those who play on the stringed instrument and sing," are consequently the same persons. Comp. 1 Chron. xv. 16, שִׁיר בְּכָלִי שִׁיר, also 1 Chron. xxiii. 5.

¹⁹³ In the Mishna too, the musicians are uniformly described as "Levites" (לֵוִיִּם), Bikkurim iii. 4; Sukka v. 4; Rosh hashana iv. 4; Arachin ii. 6; Tamid vii. 3–4.

¹⁹⁴ On the ingenious way in which those families of the musicians are traced back to Levi, see Graf in Merx' Archiv, i. p. 231 f. Only one of those families is mentioned among the exiles that returned with Zerubabel, viz. that of *Asaph*, Ezra ii. 41; Neh. vii. 44.

¹⁹⁵ See Neh. xii. 27; 1 Chron. xiii. 8, xv. 16–22, xv. 28, xvi. 5; 2 Chron. v. 12, xxix. 25; 1 Macc. iv. 54, xiii. 51. Joseph. Antt. vii. 12. 3. Sukka v. 4; Arachin ii. 3–6; Middoth ii. 6.

¹⁹⁶ Comp. p. 221, above. In the leading passage on the musical instruments, viz. Arachin ii. 3–6, מִצְבָּלָה is not mentioned at all, but merely the צִלְצֵל. Consequently one is tempted to assume that both are identically the same. But still the different terms undoubtedly denote different instruments.

instrument consisted of two large shallow plates made of brass,¹⁹⁷ which, when struck the one upon the other, emitted a loud sound. Of a somewhat more musical and harmonious character were (2) the נָבֵל, *νάβλα*, Luther: "psalter," and (3) the כִּנּוּר, *κινύρα*, Luther: "Harfe." Both were stringed instruments, the *νάβλα*, according to Josephus, having twelve and the *κινύρα* ten strings.¹⁹⁸ The *νάβλα* was played with the hand, whereas, according to the same authority just referred to, the *κινύρα* was played with the plectrum (in the earlier Biblical times the כִּנּוּר was also played with the hand).¹⁹⁹ A good deal has no doubt been written in which the nature of those instruments is fully discussed, but still no certain result has been arrived at. According to the Mishna, the number of נְבָלִים employed in the temple choir was never fewer than *two* and never more than *six*, whereas with regard to the כִּנּוּרִים, there required to be *nine* of them at the very least, and their number might be multiplied *ad libitum*.²⁰⁰ From all this one might venture to infer that the כִּנּוּר was the chief, the leading instrument, while the נָבֵל was rather intended to serve as an accompaniment to it. Besides the three instruments just referred to, *reed pipes*, חֲלִילִים, were also introduced into the choir on the occasion of the high festivals that occurred in the course of the year (Passover, Pentecost and the feast of Tabernacles).²⁰¹

But in addition to this, *trumpets* (חֲצוֹצְרוֹת) were in regular use, and while the playing upon the instruments hitherto mentioned was left entirely to the Levites (the traditions hesitating somewhat only with regard to the reed-pipes), the blowing with trumpets, on the other hand, was performed by priests. This latter was also an accompaniment above all of the offering of the daily burnt-offering, and of other parts of

¹⁹⁷ 1 Chron. xv. 19. Joseph. *Antt.* vii. 12. 3.

¹⁹⁸ *Antt.* vii. 12. 3.

¹⁹⁹ 1 Sam. xvi. 23, xviii. 10, xix. 9.

²⁰⁰ *Arachin* ii. 3. 5.

²⁰¹ On the use of those last-mentioned instruments, see in particular, *Arachin* ii. 3-4.

the service as well.²⁰² The dawn of the Sabbath was likewise announced by some of the priests blowing trumpets from the roof of the temple.²⁰³

The *services of a more menial kind* were performed, in the time of Zerubbabel, Ezra and Nehemiah, by temple slaves (נְתִינִים).²⁰⁴ It is true that נְתִינִים still continue to be mentioned in the literature of a later period,²⁰⁵ but it is no longer possible to make out with certainty what the nature of their duties now was. Instead of them we now meet with what are called "servants" (חֲנָנִים);²⁰⁶ nay we find that, in Philo, the cleaning and sweeping of the temple are mentioned along with the duty of watching as being all of them performed by the νεωκόροι, i.e. the Levites.²⁰⁷ There were also a good many functions that were left to be performed by boys belonging to the families of the priests (פְּרָחֵי כֹהֲנָה).²⁰⁸

IV. THE DAILY SERVICE.

The daily worship of the sanctuary was conducted by the twenty-four divisions of the priests (see p. 216 ff. above), each division taking its turn and officiating for a week at a time. The divisions were changed every Sabbath day, the arrange-

²⁰² See in general, Num. x. 1-10; Ezra iii. 10; Neh. xii. 35; 1 Chron. xv. 24, xvi. 6; 2 Chron. v. 12, vii. 6, xxix. 26-28; Sir. l. 16. Joseph. Antt. iii. 12. 6. Sukka v. 4-5; Rosh hashana iii. 3-4; Tamid vii. 3. Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heiligth.* book iii. chap. xlvii.

²⁰³ Joseph. Bell. Jud. iv. 9. 12. Sukka v. 5.

²⁰⁴ Ezra ii. 43, 58, 70, vii. 7, viii. 17, 20; Neh. iii. 26, 31, vii. 46, 60, 73, x. 29, xi. 3, 21; 1 Chron. ix. 2. Comp. Pfeffinger, *De Nethinaeis* (in Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. xiii.). Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Nethinim." Oehler, art. "Nethinim," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. x. 296 f.

²⁰⁵ For example, Jebamoth ii. 4; Kiddushin iv. 1; Makkoth iii. 1; Horajoth iii. 8.

²⁰⁶ Sukka iv. 4; Tamid v. 3. Comp. further, Sota vii. 7-8; Joma vii. 1.

²⁰⁷ Philo, *De praemiis sacerdotum*, sec. vi. (ed. Mangey, ii. p. 236): "Ἐτεροι δὲ τὰς στοὰς καὶ τὰ ἐν ὑπαίθρῃ κοροῦντες τὸν φορυτὸν ἐκκομίζουσιν, ἐπιμελόμενοι καθαρότητος."

²⁰⁸ Joma i. 7; Sukka v. 2; Sanhedrin ix. 6; Tamid i. 1; Middoth i. 8, iii. 8.

ment being that the retiring one should offer the morning sacrifice and the extra Sabbath offerings (according to Num. xxviii. 9, 10) before leaving, while the one that came in to take its place was to offer the evening sacrifice and put the fresh shewbread upon the table.²⁰⁹ On the occasion of the three leading festivals of the year (Passover, Pentecost, and the feast of Tabernacles) the whole twenty-four courses officiated simultaneously.²¹⁰ The attempts made by Christian scholars to make out on chronological grounds the week during which the course of Abia happened to serve in the year of our Lord's birth (Luke i. 5) have no tenable historical basis on which to rest.²¹¹ Every weekly division again was broken up into somewhere between five and nine *sub-divisions*, each of which officiated on an average for a single day the one after the other. If the sub-divisions happened to be fewer than seven, then some of them required to take their turn twice; but if, on the other hand, there happened to be more than seven, then on some of the days two of them

²⁰⁹ See, in particular, Tosefta, *Sukka* iv. 24-25 (ed. Zuckermann, p. 200); also Mishna, *Sukka* v. 7-8; *Tamid* v. 1. 2 Chron. xxiii. 4, 8 (where the priestly courses of services are evidently in question; it is otherwise in the corresponding passage 2 Kings xi. 5, 9). Joseph. *Antt.* vii. 14. 7: διέταξε τε μίαν πατριὴν διακονεῖσθαι τῷ θεῷ ἐπὶ ἡμέρας ἑκάτῳ, ἀπὸ σαββάτου ἐπὶ σάββατον. It is probable that we ought also to understand as referring to the changing of the weekly (and not the daily) divisions, the passage *contra Apion*. ii. 8: alii succedentes ad sacrificia veniunt, et congregati in templum mediante die a praecedentibus claves templi et ad numerum vasa omnia percipiunt.

²¹⁰ See *Sukka* v. 6-8, and Bartenora on *Sukka* v. 6, in Surenhusius' edition of the *Mishna*, ii. p. 279.

²¹¹ See for such attempts, Scaliger, *De emendatione temporum* (Coloniae Allobrog. 1629), Appendix, pp. 54-59. Lightfoot, *Harmonia evangelistarum*, note on Luke i. 5 (*Opp.* i. pp. 258-264). Bengel, *Ordo temporum* (1741), pp. 230-232. Wieseler, *Chronologische Synopse*, pp. 140-145. Seyffarth, *Chronologia sacra* (1846), pp. 97-103. Stawars, *Die Ordnung Abia in Beziehung auf die Bestimmung des wahren Geburtsdatums Jesu* (Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr. 1866, pp. 201-225). The calculations here in question are based partly upon purely gratuitous assumptions and partly upon a very late and somewhat untrustworthy notice in the Talmud, to the effect that the course of Jojarib was the one that happened to be officiating on the day on which the temple was destroyed (*Bab. Taanith* 29^a).

officiated at the same time (see p. 216, above). But further, as never more than a fraction of the priests belonging to a sub-division were required to officiate at the regular daily offering of the public sacrifices, it was necessary to determine by lot those on whom the active duties of the day were to devolve. Like the priests, the *Levites* were also divided into twenty-four courses of service (see p. 227 f., above), which in like manner relieved each other every week.²¹² But lastly, in addition to this there was an analogous *division of the people themselves into twenty-four courses of service* (מִשְׁמֵרוֹת), each of which had to take its turn in coming before God, every day for a whole week, by way of representing the whole body of the people while the daily sacrifice was being offered to Jehovah.²¹³ The division actually engaged in the performance of this duty was known under the designation of מַעֲמָד, "a station." At the same time the case of the ordinary Israelites differed from that of the priests and Levites in this respect, that unlike these, the entire division did not require to go up to Jerusalem when its turn came. Instead of this the persons belonging to it met together in the synagogues in the towns in or near which they resided and there engaged in prayer and the reading of Scripture; probably in every instance it was merely a deputation of them that actually went up to Jerusalem to be present at the offering of the sacrifice. In that case it was this deputation that, in the strict sense of the word, constituted the מַעֲמָד, which "stood by" while the sacrifice was being offered.²¹⁴

²¹² 1 Chron. ix. 25; 2 Chron. xxiii. 4, 8. Joseph. *Antt.* vii. 14. 7. *Taanith* iv. 2.

²¹³ On the whole arrangement, comp. Buxtorf's *Lex. Chald.* col. 1622 f. (see under עֶמֶד). Lightfoot, *Ministerium templi*, cap. vii. 3 (*Opp.* i. p. 700 f.). Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, p. 109 f. Hottinger, *De viris stationariis*, Marburg 1707 (a most exhaustive treatment of the matter). Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. iii. pp. 188–200, 204–209. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. xii. 187 (2nd ed. vol. xii. 227). Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. für Bibel und Talmud*, vol. ii. pp. 877–880 (art. "Opferbeistände").

²¹⁴ See especially, *Taanith* iv. 1–4. The principal passage, *Taanith* iv. 2,

The officiating priests wore, during the service, a special official dress, which consisted of the four following articles:— (1) *מִכְנָסִים*, *i.e.* short breeches covering merely the hips and thighs, and made of byssus (probably not cotton, but fine white linen). Then over these (2) the *כֹּהֵנֶת*, a long, somewhat close-fitting coat, reaching down to the feet, with narrow sleeves, and also made of byssus. This coat was fastened together somewhere about the breast with (3) a girdle (*אַבְנֵט*), which mostly consisted of byssus also, only it had ornaments of purple, scarlet and blue embroidered upon it. It was therefore the only part of the attire that had any colour about it, all the rest being pure white. Then the covering for the head was (4) the *מִנְעָעָה*, a kind of cap or turban.²¹⁵ Shoes

runs thus: "The early prophets instituted twenty-four courses of service (*משמורת*). There was a station (*מעמד*) in Jerusalem, consisting of priests, Levites and Israelites, to represent each course. When the time for service came round the priests and Levites of the course went up to Jerusalem, while the Israelites belonging to that course met in the synagogues of their towns and read the account of the creation." The terms of the passage are contradictory in so far as they seem to allege that the whole *מעמד* was in Jerusalem, while telling us, at the same time, that the Israelites merely assembled in the synagogues of their towns. It is probable that the correct view of the matter is given in the corresponding passage in the Tosefta (ed. Zuckerman, p. 219), where to "the Israelites belonging to that course" are added the words "who were unable to go up to Jerusalem." What is meant therefore is this, that the *whole* of the priests and Levites belonging to the same course, and who were capable of service, were bound to go up; while the Israelites, on the other hand, *might* stay at home if it did not happen to be convenient for them to go, though at the same time it is presupposed that some of them were expected to be actually present in Jerusalem. Accordingly, in *Tamid* v. 6 it is assumed without more ado that the "head of the station" (*ראש המעמד*) was regularly present in the capital. A similar view of the matter is taken by Herzfeld, for example, iii. p. 193, and Hamburger, ii. p. 878. *Bikkurim* iii. 2 proceeds on the assumption that there were station-districts or circles marked off by definite boundaries and having some leading town as the centre of each. Comp. besides, *Taanith* ii. 7.

²¹⁵ For the priests' attire, see Ezek. xliv. 17–19; Ex. xxviii. 40–43, xxxix. 27–29, and above all the minute description of it in Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 7. 1–3. Philo's brief notice in *Vita Mosis*, iii. 13 (Mang. ii. 157): *χιτῶνας λινοῦς, ζώνας τε καὶ περισκελῆ*; *De monarchia*, ii. 5 (Mang. ii. 225): *ἡ δὲ ἐσθὴς ἐστὶ χιτῶν λινοῦς καὶ περίζωμα*. Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 9. 6: *λενὴν στολὴν*. Aristæas, ed. M. Schmidt in *Merx' Archiv*, i. 270. 1–2: *τῶν ἱερέων κεκαλυμ-*

are nowhere mentioned, and it may be regarded as certain that the priests always officiated without having anything on the feet.²¹⁶

As the white attire was a symbol of purity, so the

μένων μέχρι τῶν σφυρῶν βυσσίνοις χιτῶσιν. The literature of our subject is the same as that already referred to in connection with the high priest's dress; see note 124, above. On the question as to whether byssus is to be identified with cotton or with linen, see among others, Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Baumwolle;" Dillmann's note on Ex. xxv. 4; Haneberg, *Die religiösen Alterthümer*, pp. 536-538 (who is of opinion that Rosellini has decided the question, and that in favour of cotton); and, on the other side, Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, vol. ii. (1882) p. 464 f., and the leading work on the subject quoted there, viz. Yates' *Textrinum antiquorum, An Account of the Art of Weaving among the Ancients*, part i. London 1843; also Hehn, *Culturpflanzen und Haustiere*, 3rd ed. p. 145. As the ancients did not always carefully distinguish between linen and cotton, it is quite possible that there were some instances in which cotton was also made use of for making the priests' attire (as witness, for example, the fine Indian fabric from which the garments were made which the high priest was in the habit of wearing on the afternoon of the great day of atonement, and which consisted of that material). On the other hand, it may be taken as certain that, as a rule, it was linen that was used. According to Mishna, *Kilajim* ix. 1, only flax (פשתים) and sheep's wool (צמר) were employed for the purpose in question, the latter being for the parti-coloured ornamentation on the girdle; see the commentaries in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, vol. i. p. 149, and Braun's *Vestitus sacerdotum Hebraeorum*, i. 6. 2, ii. 3. 4. It is with reference to this matter that it is said in Josephus, *Antt.* iv. 8. 11: μηδείς δ' ἐξ ὑμῶν κλωστήν ἐξ ἐρίου καὶ λίνου στολὴν φορεῖτω· τοῖς γὰρ ἱερεῦσι μόνοις ταύτην ἀποδεδείχθαι. Consequently the priests' attire was expressly exempted from the prohibition of Lev. xix. 19; Deut. xxii. 11.

²¹⁶ See Bartenora on *Shekalim* v. 1 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. 192). Braun's *Vestitus sacerdotum* Heb. i. 3. 3 (pp. 43-47). Carpzov, *Discalceatio religiosa in loco sacro ad Ex.* iii. 5 (in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxix.). Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xiii. 405 ff. Winer's *Realwörterb.* ii. 271. Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. vii. p. 718. The following passage occurs in *Megilla* iv. 8 with reference to the worship of the synagogue: "He who says, I will not lead the prayers in coloured clothes, as little is he to do so in white attire. He who is unwilling to do so with sandals on, as little is he to do it barefooted." The meaning of which is simply this, that in the service of the synagogue no one is to presume to wear the dress of a priest. With regard to the priests' benediction, on the other hand, Jochanan ben Sakkai is said to have ordained, that even after the destruction of the temple it was still to be pronounced by them only with the feet bare (*Rosh hashana* 31b; *Sota* 496. Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, p. 305, note 3).

officiating priests required to be men characterized by *temperance and Levitical purity*. During the period of their service they were prohibited from drinking wine or any other intoxicating beverage.²¹⁷ Nor were they allowed to enter the court for the purpose of officiating unless they were Levitically clean. Nay more, even those who were so were, in every instance, required to take a formal bath previous to their entering upon the services of the day.²¹⁸ But besides this, they had then to go and *wash the hands and feet* in the brazen laver (כִּיֹּר) that stood in the open air between the temple and the altar of burnt-offering.²¹⁹

As regards the sacrifices that were offered every day,²²⁰ they are to be distinguished into *two classes*, the *public* and

²¹⁷ Lev. x. 8-11; Ezek. xlv. 21. Pseudo-Hecataeus in Josephus, *contra Apion*. i. 22 (ed. Bekker, p. 204, 26 ff.): τὸ παραπαῦν οἶνον οὐ πίνοντες ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. Philo, *De monarchia*, ii. 7. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 12. 2; *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 7. Mishna, *Taanith* ii. 7. Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, xiii. 885 ff. (where are given *in extenso* in Hebrew and Latin the passages from the *Jer. Taanith* 65d; *Tosefta, Taanith* ii., *Sifra* and *Pesikta* to Lev. x. 9).

²¹⁸ *Joma* iii. 3: "No priest is to be allowed to enter the court for the purpose of officiating, *even though he be already clean*, without having taken a bath;" comp. *Tamid* i. 2. A bath had also to be taken above all after every occasion of doing their needs, *Joma* iii. 2. On the place where the bath was to be taken, see *Tamid* i. 1; *Middoth* i. 9, *fin*.

²¹⁹ Ex. xxx. 17-21, xl. 30-32. *Tamid* i. 4, ii. 1. Philo, *Vita Mosis*, iii. 15: πόδας μάλιστα καὶ χεῖρας ἀπονιπτόμενοι. On the כִּיֹּר itself, see also Ex. xxxviii. 8; *Sir.* l. 3; *Middoth* iii. 6; *Joma* iii. 10; *Tamid* iii. 8. Lightfoot, *Descriptio templi*, cap. xxxvii. 1 (*Opp.* i. 643 sq.). Clemens, *De labro aeneo*, Traject. ad Rh. 1725 (also in Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. xix.). The commentaries in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. 223, v. 360. Iken, *Tractatus talmudicus de cultu quotidiano*, 1736, pp. 32-34 (full of matter). Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Handfass." Bähr's *Symbolik*, 2nd ed. i. pp. 583-586. Kohler's *Lehrb. der Bibl. Geschichte*, i. p. 373 f.

²²⁰ On the sacrificial worship generally, see Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heiligh.* book iii. chap. xxxiii.-xlvi. Bähr's *Symbolik*, ii. 187-522. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Opfer;" and in addition, the various articles on Brandopfer, Schuld- und Sündopfer, Dankopfer, Speisopfer, Trankopfer, Räuchern, etc. Oehler's art. "Opfercultus des alten Testaments," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* (1st ed. x. 614-652, 2nd ed. xi. 29-61). Thalhoffer, *Die unblutigen Opfer des mosaisch. Cult.* 1848. Kurtz, *Der alttestamentliche Opfercult. nach seiner Begründung und Anwendung dargestellt und erläutert*, 1862. Kohler's *Lehrb. der Bibl. Geschichte*, i. p. 387. Wellhausen, *Geschichte Israels*, i. 53-84. Dillmann's *Exeget. Handb. zu Exod. u. Levit*

the *private* sacrifices.²²¹ The former were offered in name of the people, and were purchased with a portion of the people's own offerings, especially the half-shekel tax; while the latter again were those in which only private individuals were concerned, and which might be offered on a vast variety of occasions, some of them being voluntary and others of them being, for some particular reason or other, compulsory. Both those categories again were sub-divided into different sorts, varying according to the particular objects for which they were offered, though they all admit of being classified under the three following heads:—(1) the *burnt-offerings*, the essential characteristic of which lay in the fact that the whole victim was consumed upon the altar; (2) the *sin-* and the *trespass-offerings*, in the case of which only the fat was burnt upon the altar, while the flesh fell to the priests; (3) the *peace-offerings* (זִבְחֵי שְׁלָמִים), according to Luther, "thank-offerings," in the case of which again it was only the fat that was burnt upon the altar, while the flesh was used by the owner of the sacrifice himself as material for a jocund sacrificial feast.²²² As was only natural, it was the numerous

pp, 373-387. The dictionaries of Schenkel and Riehm, and the archaeological works of De Wette, Ewald, Keil, Haneberg and others.

²²¹ Philo, *De victimis*, sec. iii. (ed. Mang., ii. 238 f.): 'Ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν θυσιαῶν, αἱ μὲν εἰσιν ὑπὲρ ἅπαντος τοῦ ἔθνους, εἰ δὲ δεῖ τὸ ἀληθὲς εἰπεῖν ὑπὲρ ἅπαντος ἀνθρώπων γένους, αἱ δὲ ὑπὲρ ἐκάστου τῶν ἱερουργεῖν ἀξιούντων, λεκτέον πρότερον περὶ τῶν κοινῶν. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 9. 1: δύο μὲν γὰρ εἰσιν ἱερουργαὶ τούτων ὃ ἥ μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν, ἑτέρα δ' ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου συντελεσμέναι κ.τ.λ.

²²² In the leading passage on the classification of the sacrifices, viz. Lev. i-vii., there are, strictly speaking, *five leading kinds* of them mentioned: (1) the burnt-offering, (2) the meat-offering, (3) the peace-offering, (4) the sin-offering, and (5) the trespass-offering. But the meat-offering is certainly not to be regarded as being on a level with the animal sacrifices, seeing that, like the drink-offering, it occurs for the most part simply as an accompaniment of such sacrifices. With regard to the sin- and trespass-offerings, they are no doubt distinct, yet they are so much akin to each other that they may well be regarded as *one species*. Consequently in the case of the animal sacrifices, and these are by far the most important of all, we ought to distinguish them into three leading kinds, as Philo and Josephus have already done (the former *De victimis*, § iv., and the latter

private offerings of so many different kinds that constituted the bulk of the sacrifices. However, as it is with giving an account of the *regular* daily worship of the sanctuary that we are here concerned, it is only the public sacrifices that fall to be considered by us, and especially the most important of them all, *the people's daily burnt-offering*.

In order that the reader may be in a better position for understanding what is to follow, it will be well, before proceeding farther, to offer here one or two topographical observations.²²³ The *inner court*, within which the whole of the worship was celebrated, was divided by means of a wall into two divisions, a western and an eastern. The latter was called "the court of the women," *not* however because *none* but women were admitted to it, but because women *as well* as men were allowed to enter it.²²⁴ The beautiful gateway in the east side of this court, with its elaborate two-leaved gate made of brass (ἡ θύρα ἡ λεγομένη ὥραία, Acts iii. 2), formed the principal entrance to it; and hence it was that beggars were in the habit of sitting here (Acts iii. 2). The western division again was reserved exclusively for male Israelites, and within it stood the *temple* proper. Comparatively speaking, this was not a large, but a handsome edifice. The interior, which was probably almost quite dark, was divided into two divisions, the larger one being to the front,

Antt. iii. 9. 1-3). *The whole three classes enter into public and private sacrifices alike*, although in the former the *peace-offering* (זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים) is, of course, of but rare occurrence, the only time at which it is regularly offered being Pentecost (Lev. xxiii. 19); otherwise we meet with it only on special occasions (see Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Dankopfer"). The flesh of the public peace-offerings belonged to the priests (Lev. xxiii. 20). On these in general, see *Pesachim* vii. 4; *Sebachim* v. 5; *Menachoth* v. 7; *Meila* ii. 5. The *burnt-offerings* and the *sin-offerings* offered in the name of the whole body of the people were of very frequent recurrence; see the catalogue of those for festival days in Num. xxviii.-xxix.

²²³ For the sources and literature connected with the temple of Herod, see § 15, above.

²²⁴ See Joseph. *contra Apion.* ii. 8: In secundam vero porticum (by which the women's court is meant) cuncti Judaei ingrediebantur eorumque conjuges.

and the other, which was only half as large, being at the back. The latter formed the "holy of holies," which was trodden by human foot only once in the year, and that by the high priest on the great day of atonement. In the front (and therefore eastern) division stood those three sacred articles, the punctual ministering at which on the part of the officiating priests formed one of the principal parts of the worship, viz.: (1) in the middle the *golden altar of incense* (מִזְבֵּחַ הָהָרֶב), known also as the "*inner altar*" (מִזְבֵּחַ הַפְּנִימִי), upon which incense had to be offered every morning and evening;²²⁵ (2) to the south of the latter the *golden candlestick* with seven branches (מְנוֹרָה), which had to be kept constantly burning;²²⁶ and (3) to the

²²⁵ On the daily offering of the incense, see Ex. xxx. 7, 8. On the preparation of the incense itself, Ex. xxx. 34-38. On the altar of incense, Ex. xxx. 1-10, xxxvii. 25-29; 1 Macc. i. 21, iv. 29. Philo, *Vita Mosis*, iii. 9. *De victimis offerentibus*, sec. iv. Josephus, *Antt.* iii. 6. 8; *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 5. Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heiligh.* book i. chap. xxv.-xxvii. Monographs in Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. xi. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, arts. "Räucheraltar" and "Räuchern." Thalhofer, *Die unblut. Opfer des mos. Cultes*, pp. 78-82, 131-139. Bähr's *Symbolik*, 2nd ed. i. pp. 499-505. Bleek, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, ii. 2. 479 ff., note on ix. 4. Leyrer's arts. "Räucheraltar" and "Räuchern," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. xii. 502-513. The same articles in the second edition re-written by Orelli, vol. xii. 483-489. Delitzsch in Riehm's *Wörterb.* pp. 1255-1260. מִזְבֵּחַ הָהָרֶב, *Joma* v. 5, 7; *Chagiga* iii. 8; *Sebachim* v. 2; *Menachoth* iii. 6, iv. 4. מִזְבֵּחַ הַפְּנִימִי, *Joma* ii. 3, v. 5; *Sebachim* iv. 2; *Meila* iii. 4; *Tamid* iii. 6. 9, vi. 1. Wellhausen's doubts as to the actual existence of the altar of incense (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1877, p. 410 ff.) are disposed of by a unanimous testimony in its favour from the time of the Maccabees down to Josephus and the Mishna. On the other hand, it certainly appears as though it had been introduced at a somewhat latish period. It is worth noting that as yet Pseudo-Hecataeus (in Joseph. *contra Apion.* i. 22, ed. Bekker, p. 204, 19-21) mentions nothing else as being in the interior of the temple but the candlestick and a golden *βωμός*, which latter might as readily be supposed to refer to the table for the shewbread as to the altar of incense.

²²⁶ On the duties connected with the candlestick, see Ex. xxvii. 20, 21, xxx. 7, 8; Lev. xxiv. 1-4; Num. viii. 1-4; 2 Chron. xiii. 11. From the passages just quoted it would seem as though the lamps on the candlestick were to be lighted only in the evening with a view to their burning during the night. So also Philo, *De victimis offerentibus*, sec. vii. *init.* But, according to Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 8. 3, *fn.*, on the other hand, *three* of the lamps were kept burning during the day and the whole *seven* during the night; while according to the Mishna *only one* was lighted during the day and the whole

north of the altar of incense the golden *table for the shewbread*, on which twelve fresh loaves had to be placed every Sabbath day.²²⁷ The front of the temple looked toward the east. Before it and in the open air stood the great *altar of burnt-offering*, or "the altar" *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, at which, with the exception of the burning of the incense, every act of sacrifice had to be performed. It was a high four-square erection of large dimensions, being, according to the Mishna, thirty-two cubits square at the base (while for the sake of comparison it may be mentioned that the interior of the temple was only twenty cubits wide). It diminished in size toward the top in such a way as to form several stages or landings round it, although on the top it still measured as much as twenty-four

seven at night (*Tamid* iii. 9, vi. 1, and the reference to those passages by Krüger, *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1857, p. 248 f.). Comp. further, Pseudo-Hecataeus in Joseph. *contra Apion.* i. 22: ἐπὶ τούτων φῶς ἔστιν ἀναπόσβεστον καὶ τὰς νύκτας καὶ τὰς ἡμέρας. Diodor. xxxiv. 1 (ed. Müller): τὸν δὲ ἀθάνατον λεγόμενον παρ' αὐτοῖς λύχνον καὶ καίόμενον ἀδιαλείπτως ἐν τῇ ναῷ. On the candlestick itself, see Ex. xxv. 31-40, xxxvii. 17-24; 1 Macc. i. 21, iv. 49. Philo, *Vita Mosis*, iii. 9. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 6, 7; *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 5, vii. 5. 5. Mishna, *Menachoth* iii. 7, iv. 4, ix. 3, *fin.*; *Tamid* iii. 6, 9, vi. 1. Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heiligth.* book i. chap. xxiii. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Leuchter." Bähr, *Symbolik*, 2nd ed. i. 492-499. Krüger, *Der siebenarmige Leuchter* (*Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.* 1857, pp. 238-261). Riehm's *Wörterb.*, art. "Leuchter" (with illustrations). On the position of the candlestick to the south of the altar of incense, see Ex. xxvi. 35, xl. 24.

²²⁷ On the duties connected with the table of shewbread, see Lev. xxiv. 5-9. Philo, *De victimis*, sec. iii. (ed. Mang., ii. 239 f.). Josephus, *Antt.* iii. 10. 7. On the table of shewbread itself, see Ex. xxv. 23-30, xxxvii. 10-16; 1 Macc. i. 22, iv. 49. Philo, *Vita Mosis*, iii. 10. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 6. 6; *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 5, vii. 5. 5. Mishna, *Menachoth* xi. 5-7. Comp. further the description of the table alleged to have been presented to the temple by Ptolemy Philadelphus as given by Pseudo-Aristeas (Havercamp's *Joseph.* ii. 2. 109-111. Merx' *Archiv*, i. 264-267. Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 2. 7, 8). Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heiligth.* book i. chap. xxiv. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, arts. "Schaubrode" and "Schaubrodtsch." Bähr's *Symbolik*, 2nd ed. i. pp. 488-492. Thalhofer, *Die unblut. Opfer des mos. Cultes*, pp. 73-78, 156-168. Leyrer, arts. "Schaubrod" and "Schaubrodtsch," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. xiii. 467-472. Delitzsch in Riehm's *Wörterb.* pp. 1388-1392 (with an illustration). Strack in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 2nd ed. vol. xiii. 455-458. On the position of the table to the north of the altar of incense, see Ex. xxvi. 35, xl. 22.

cubits by twenty-four.²²⁸ The whole structure was built of unhewn stones which no tool had ever touched.²²⁹ Then, on the south side, there was a gradual ascent leading upward to the top of the altar, and this was likewise formed of unhewn stones. The fire upon this altar had to be kept continually burning by night as well as by day.²³⁰ Between the temple and the altar of burnt-offering there stood, and likewise in the open air, the *brazen laver* (פִּיּוֹר) already referred to, in which the priests were required to wash their hands and feet previous to their engaging in the worship of the sanctuary. To the north of the altar, and still in the open air, was the place for slaughtering the victims, where there were rings fastened in the ground to which the animals were tied when

²²⁸ Comp. in particular, the descriptions of it in the Mishna, *Middoth* iii. 1-4, and in Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 6; further, Pseudo-Hecataeus in Joseph. *contra Apion.* i. 22 (ed. Bekker, p. 264. 16 ff.); Aristaeas, ed. M. Schmidt in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 269 f. (in Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 112); 1 Macc. iv. 44-47. Philo, *De victimis offerentibus*, sec. iv. Also measurements given in Ezek. xlii. 13-17. Monographs in Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. x. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Brandopferaltar." Bähr's *Symbolik*, 2nd ed. i. pp. 579-582.

²²⁹ Pseudo-Hecataeus in Josephus, *contra Apion.* i. 22: οὐκ ἐκ τμητῶν ἀλλ' ἐκ συλλέκτων ἀργῶν λίθων. 1 Macc. iv. 47. Philo, *De victimis offerentibus*, sec. iv.: ἐκ λίθων λογάδων καὶ ἀτμήτων. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 6. Mishna, *Middoth* iii. 4. The oldest and most primitive altars were undoubtedly made merely of rough stones taken from the field, or even of simple heaps of earth; and the Jehovistic legislation proceeds on the assumption that these were the kind that were still in ordinary use (Ex. xx. 24-26; comp. Deut. xxvii. 5, 6). But we find that as early as the days of Solomon this monarch ordered a brazen altar to be erected in Jerusalem (1 Kings viii. 64, ix. 25; 2 Kings xvi. 14, 15; 2 Chron. iv. 1). The priest-code, inasmuch as it seeks to describe the whole sanctuary as being of a portable character, accordingly represents the altar of burnt-offering as having been made of wood and covered with brass (Ex. xxvii. 1-8, xxxviii. 1-7; Num. xvii. 1-5). We can scarcely think that one of this description ever existed. The practice of post-exilic times reverted rather to a compliance with the older legal prescriptions contained in Ex. xx. 25; Deut. xxvii. 5, 6. Comp. in general, Wellhausen's *Geschichte*, i. pp. 30, 38 f.

²³⁰ Lev. vi. 6. Philo, *De victimis offerentibus*, sec. v. *init.* (ed. Mangey, ii. 254). Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 6. Comp. further, 2 Macc. i. 18-36, and Buxtorf, *Historia ignis sacri et coelestis sacrificia consumentis* (in Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. x.). Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heiligh.* book i. chap. xxxiv.

about to be slaughtered; while there were pillars at hand on which to hang the victims after they were killed, as well as marble tables on which to skin them and wash the entrails.²³¹ The temple, along with the altar of burnt-offering and the place for slaughtering, was surrounded by an enclosure within which, as a rule, none but priests were allowed to enter, ordinary Israelites being permitted to do so only "when it was necessary for the purpose of the laying on of hands, or for slaughtering, or waving" (תְּנוּפָה).²³²

Now, as regards the regular worship of the sanctuary, the most important part of it was the *daily burnt-offering offered in the name of the people at large*, the עֹלֶת הַתָּמִיד, or simply הַתָּמִיד, "the standing one."²³³ The practice of offering regular daily sacrifice is, comparatively speaking, of very ancient date. But it underwent certain modifications at different periods; not only in so far as, previous to the exile, the kings were in the habit of defraying the cost of the sacrifices (Ezek. xlv. 17 and xlv. 13-15, Sept. version), whereas they were subsequently provided at the expense of the people, but also as regards the character and number of the sacrifices themselves.²³⁴ In the

²³¹ *Middoth* iii. 5, v. 2; *Tamid* iii. 5; *Shekalim* vi. 4. That the slaughtering of the burnt-offerings had to take place to the north of the altar is prescribed as early as Lev. i. 11. But it was further required that the sin- and trespass-offerings should also be slaughtered at the very same place (Lev. iv. 24, 29, 33, vi. 18, vii. 2, xiv. 13). This prescription is omitted only in the case of the peace-offerings; see Knobel-Dillmann's note on Lev. i. 11. For more precise information as to the places where the victims were slaughtered, see *Sebachim* v.

²³² On this enclosure, see especially, Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 6; *Antt.* xiii. 13. 5. But according to *Kelim* i. 8, ordinary Israelites were also allowed to enter this "court of the priests" for the purposes stated in the text.

²³³ עֹלֶת הַתָּמִיד, for example, in Num. xxviii. 10, 15, 24, 31, xxix. 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38; Ezra iii. 5; Neh. x. 34. הַתָּמִיד, for example, in Dan. viii. 11-13, xi. 31, xii. 12; Mishna, *Pesachim* v. 1; *Joma* vii. 3; *Taanith* iv. 6; *Menachoth* iv. 4. It is from this that the whole tractate bearing the title of *Tamid* derives its name.

²³⁴ For what follows, comp. Kuenen, *De godsdienst van Israël*, ii. 270-272. Wellhausen's *Geschichte Israels*, i. pp. 81, 82. Reuss, *L'histoire sainte et la loi* (*La Bible, Ancien Testament*, part iii.), i. 202. Smend's *Exeget.*

time of Ahaz the morning sacrifice consisted only of a burnt-offering, and the evening one of simply a meat-offering (2 Kings xvi. 15). This had become so much of an established practice that various parts of the day took their names from it. To speak for example of anything as happening at the time "when the meat-offering was presented" was equivalent to saying toward evening (1 Kings xviii. 29, 36). Not only so, but this mode of denoting the hour of the day had become so completely established that it continued in use even long after the practice had been introduced of offering a burnt-offering in the evening as well (Ezra ix. 4, 5; Dan. ix. 21).²³⁵ It would appear that this had not been introduced as yet in Ezekiel's time. Yet in his day there must have been already an advance upon the older practice, in so far as, according to this prophet, both a burnt-offering and a meat-offering would seem to have been offered in the morning (Ezek. xlv. 13-15). On the other hand, by the time the priest-code came to be in force it was prescribed that *both a burnt-offering and a meat-offering should be offered every morning and every evening as well*, and further, that on every occasion they should also be accompanied with a drink-offering (Ex. xxix. 38-42; Num. xxviii. 3-8). And so we find that, in the time of the author of the Chronicles, the practice thus established of offering a burnt-offering twice every day in the course of the daily service was looked upon as one of long standing (1 Chron. xvi. 40; 2 Chron. xiii. 11, xxxi. 3). This then formed the true heart and centre of the whole sacrificial system of worship. In no circumstances whatever could it be allowed to be dispensed with. We find, for example, that in the year 70 Jerusalem had for a con-

Handbuch zu Ezekiel, p. 381 f. The objections advanced by Dillmann, *Exeget. Handbuch zu Exod. u. Levit.* p. 313, can in no way affect what is a simple and undoubted matter of fact.

²³⁵ In the Mishna even the expression "time of the *minchah*" (of the meat-offering) continues to be used as equivalent to the afternoon; for example, *Berachoth* iv. 1; *Pesachim* x. 1; *Rosh hashana*, iv. 4; *Megilla* iii. 6, iv. 1.

siderable time been invested by the Romans, and that, in consequence, the scarcity of food had reached a climax, but for all that the daily sacrifices continued to be regularly offered; and it was felt by the Jews to be one of the heaviest calamities that could have befallen them when, on the 17th of Tammuz, they at last found themselves in the position of having no more to offer.²³⁶

The following are the more specific prescriptions contained in the priest-code with regard to the *Tamid* (Ex. xxxix. 38-42; Num. xxviii. 3-8).²³⁷ Every morning and evening alike a male lamb of a year old and without blemish was to be offered as a *burnt-offering*, and in doing so all those regulations were required to be observed that apply to burnt-offerings generally, particularly those contained in Lev. i. 10-13 and vi. 1-6. Not only so, but on every occasion a *meat-offering* and a *drink-offering* were to be offered along with the burnt-offering, as it is prescribed by the priest-code that these were to accompany all burnt-offerings without exception (Num. xv. 1-16). In cases in which the victim happened to be a lamb, the meat-offering was to consist of one-tenth of an ephah of fine flour (סֹלֶת), which was to be mixed (בָּלִיל, therefore not *baked*) with a quarter of a hin of pure oil; while the corresponding drink-offering was to consist of a quarter of a hin of wine. The time at which the morning sacrifice was to be offered was early dawn; that for the evening sacrifice again was to be, in Biblical phraseology, בֵּין הָעֶרְבַּיִם, *i.e.* in the evening twilight, though at a later period it had become the practice to offer the evening sacrifice so early as the afternoon, or

²³⁶ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 1; Mishna, *Taanith* iv. 6. Similarly in the days of the persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes the suppression of the *Tamid* was regarded as one of the most serious calamities possible (Dan. viii. 11-13, xi. 31, xii. 11).

²³⁷ Comp. further, Lightfoot's *Ministerium templi*, cap. ix. (*Opp.* i. 716-722). Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heiligth.* book v. chap. i.-ii. Winer's *Realwörterb.*, art. "Morgen- und Abendopfer." Keil, *Handb. der bibl. Archæol.* (2nd ed. 1875) p. 373 f. Haneberg, *Die religiösen Alterthümer*, pp. 604-609. For full details, consult the tractate *Tamid*, and comp. note 250, below.

according to our mode of reckoning, somewhere about three o'clock.²³⁸

It was also the regular practice to offer *the daily meat-offering of the high priest* in conjunction with the daily burnt-offering of the people. For, according to Lev. vi. 12–16, the high priest was required to offer a meat-offering every day (תמיד),²³⁹ both morning and evening, and one too which differed from that offered in the name of the people along with their burnt-offering, not only in respect of quantity, but also as regards the mode in which it was prepared. It consisted altogether of only the tenth of an ephah of fine flour, of which one half was offered in the morning and the other half in the evening; and not only was it mixed with oil, but after being so it was *baked* in a flat pan (מַצֵּה); the cakes thus prepared were then broken into pieces, oil was poured over them, and then they were duly offered (Lev. vi. 14; comp. Lev.

²³⁸ On the principal occasion on which they speak of the *Tamid*, Philo and Josephus simply reproduce the scriptural statements with regard to the times for offering it (Philo, *De victimis*, sec. iii.: Καθ' ἐκάστην μὲν οὖν ἡμέραν δύο ἀμνοὺς ἀνάγειν διείρηται, τὸν μὲν ἅμα τῇ ἑφ, τὸν δὲ δείλης ἐσπέρας. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 10. 1: ἐκ δὲ τοῦ δημοσίου ἀναλάματος νόμος ἐστὶν ἄρνα καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν σφάζεσθαι τῶν αὐτοεῶν ἀρχομένης τε ἡμέρας καὶ ληγούσης). What the actual practice was in later times is clearly evident from *Antt.* xiv. 4. 3: δις τῆς ἡμέρας, πρωὶ τε καὶ περὶ ἐνάτην ὥραν, ἱεουργούντων ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ. This entirely accords with the statement of the Mishna (*Pesachim* v. 1), to the effect that the evening sacrifice was usually slaughtered about half-past eight and offered about half-past nine o'clock (consequently, according to our reckoning, about half-past two and half-past three o'clock in the afternoon). Comp. further, Josephus, *contra Apion.* ii. 8 (ed. Bekker, p. 239): Mane etiam aperto templo oportebat facientes traditas hostias introire et meridie rursus dum clauderetur templum. And hence it was also the practice to go to the temple about the ninth hour for devotional purposes (*Acts* iii. 1, x. 3, 30). See in general, Herzfeld's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iii. 184 f.

²³⁹ With this it is impossible to reconcile the words "in the day when he is anointed," Lev. vi. 20; one or other is a later interpolation. See Dillmann's *Exeget. Handb. zu Exod. u. Levit.* p. 442. Jewish and Christian expositors have endeavoured in various ways to dispose of the discrepancy contained in this passage. See Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (1851), p. 143 f. Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heiligh.* book iii. chap. ix. Thalhofer, *Die unblut. Opfer der mos. Cultes* (1848), pp. 139–151.

ii. 5-6).²⁴⁰ Owing to the circumstance of its being made ready in a *מִהְבֵּת*, it was known at a later period simply as the *הַבִּיתִּים*, "the baked (the cakes), which is the designation already given to it, directly or indirectly, by the author of the Chronicles,²⁴¹ and subsequently by the Mishna in particular.²⁴² Now as the presenting of this offering was incumbent upon the high priest, we are, of course, justified in speaking of him as offering a daily sacrifice.²⁴³ At the same time it must be borne in mind that here the high priest is to be regarded as the offerer of the sacrifice only in the same sense in which the people is so in the case of the daily burnt-offering, i.e. he causes it to be offered in his name and at his own expense,²⁴⁴ but it was by no means necessary that he himself should officiate on the occasion. In fact the expression used in connection with this matter in Lev. vi. 15 is not *יָקִיר* but merely

²⁴⁰ On the mode of preparation, comp. further, Philo, *De victimis*, sec. xv. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 10. 7; *Menachoth* xi. 3. Both *לֶחֶם* (kneading) and *אִפִּיר* (baking) formed part of the process. Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heiligth.* book iii. chap. xxxix. pp. 56-61. Thalhofer, *Die unblut. Opfer*, p. 151 ff.

²⁴¹ 1 Chron. ix. 31. In this passage the Septuagint simply paraphrases the words *מִעֲשֵׂה הַחֲבִיתִים* as follows: τὰ ἔργα τῆς θυσίας τοῦ τηγάνου τοῦ μεγάλου ἱερέως. So also Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, under *חֲבִיתִים*. But it is probable that the author of the Chronicles may have had in view the baked meat-offering generally, and not that of the high priest alone.

²⁴² *Tamid* i. 3, iii. 1, iv. fin.; *Joma* ii. 3, iii. 4; *Menachoth* iv. 5, xi. 3; *Middoth* i. 4.

²⁴³ Philo, *De specialibus legibus*, ii. sec. xxiii. (Mang. ii. 321): εὐχὰς δὲ καὶ θυσίας τελεῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν. The well-known passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews (vii. 27) is also to be explained on this ground; only it must be understood that this daily meat-offering on the part of the high priest was not a sin-offering, as the passage in question might lead one to suppose. On several Talmudic passages in which, either apparently or in reality, it is the daily offering of a sacrifice on the part of the high priest that is in question, see Herzfeld's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. p. 140 f.

²⁴⁴ Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 10. 7: θύει δ' ὁ ἱερεὺς (= the high priest) ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀναλωμάτων, καὶ δις ἑκάστης ἡμέρας τοῦτο ποιεῖ, ἄλευρον ἐλαίῳ μεμαγμένον καὶ πεπηγὸς ὅπτῃσι βραχείᾳ καὶ εἷς μὲν ἐστὶν ἀσάβρων τοῦ ἀλεύρου, τούτου δὲ τὸ μὲν ἦρυσιν πρῶτ' τὸ δ' ἕτερον δαίλης ἐπιφέρει τῷ πυρί. When a high priest died, the meat-offering had to be furnished at the expense of the people (according to Rabbi Juda, *Shekalim* vii. 6, at the expense of his heirs) until his successor was installed.

הַכֹּהֵן. We learn from Josephus that the high priest officiated as a rule on the Sabbath and on festival days (see p. 255, above). But on ordinary occasions the meat-offering of the high priest, in common with the sacrifices of the people, was offered by the priests who happened to be officiating for the time being; and when the lots were drawn with the view of deciding who were to take the various parts of the service for the day, one was always drawn at the same time to determine who was to be entrusted with the duty of presenting the הַכֹּהֵן, i.e. the meat-offering of the high priest.²⁴⁵ Nay more—seeing that the law speaks of this offering as being an offering of Aaron and his sons (Lev. vi. 13),—there is no reason why it should not also be conceived of as a sacrifice which the priests offered for themselves.²⁴⁶

Besides the offering of the sacrifices just referred to, the priests in the course of the daily service were also called upon to perform certain functions inside the temple in connection with the altar of incense and the candlestick. On the former incense had to be offered every morning and every evening alike (Ex. xxx. 7, 8), that offered in the morning being *previous* to the offering of the burnt-offering, and that in

²⁴⁵ *Tamid* iii. 1, iv. *fn.*; *Joma* ii. 3. It is true, no doubt, that, strictly speaking, what is in view in the passages here referred to is not the actual offering of the sacrifice, but the bringing of the materials of it to the ascent leading to the top of the altar. Still, according to *Tamid* v. 2, *Joma* ii. 4–5, there was also appointed for the actual offering (the carrying of the sacrifice up to the altar hearth) precisely the same number of priests again as were employed in bringing it to the foot of the altar, viz. nine, corresponding to the nine parts of which the sacrifice was composed, and among which, even in the passages first referred to (*Tamid* iii. 1, iv. *fn.*; *Joma* ii. 3), the כֹּהֲנִים are expressly mentioned. Consequently, there can be no doubt whatever that the actual offering of the כֹּהֲנִים also devolved, as a rule, upon an ordinary priest.

²⁴⁶ Philo, *Quis rerum div. heres.* sec. xxxvi. (Mang. i. 497): Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἐνδελεχεῖς θυσίας ὁρᾷς εἰς ἴσα διηρημένας, ἣν τε ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀνάγουσιν οἱ ἱερεῖς διὰ τῆς σεμιδάλεως, καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν δυοῖν ἀμυνῶν, οὓς ἀναφέρειν δείρηται. *De victimis*, sec. xv. (ed. Mang. ii. 250): Σεμιδαλις γὰρ ἡ ἐνδελεχὴς αὐτῶν θυσία μέτρου ἱεροῦ τὸ δέκατον καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, οὐ τὸ μὲν ἡμῖσις πρωΐας, τὸ δὲ ἡμῖσις δείλης προσάγεται ταγηνισθὲν ἐν ἐλαίῳ, μηδενὸς εἰς βρώσιν ὑπολειφθέντος.

the evening, on the other hand, coming *after* it, so that the daily burnt-offering was, as it were, girt round with the offering of incense.²⁴⁷ Then further, with regard to the *candlestick*, it had to be attended to every morning and every evening. In the morning the lamps were trimmed and replenished with oil, when one or more of them (according to Josephus three) were allowed to burn throughout the day. In the evening again the rest of them were lighted, for it was prescribed that during the night the whole seven were to be burning (see especially Ex. xxx. 7, 8; 2 Chron. xiii. 11; and in general, p. 281, above).

Then lastly, with the view of imparting greater beauty to the worship, it was also deemed proper to have *vocal and instrumental music*. When the burnt-offering was being presented the Levites broke in with singing and playing upon their instruments, while two priests blew silver trumpets (2 Chron. xxix. 26–28; Num. x. 1, 2, 10). While this was going on the people were also assembled in the temple for prayer. At the pauses in the singing the priests sounded a fanfare with their trumpets, and as often as they did so the people fell down and worshipped.²⁴⁸ There was a special

²⁴⁷ Philo, *De victimis*, sec. iii. (Mangey, ii. 239): δις δὲ καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἐπιθυμῶνται τὰ πάντων εὐαδέστατα θυμιαμάτων εἶσω τοῦ καταπετάσματος, ἀνίσχοντος ἡλίου καὶ δυομένου πρότε τῆς ἡωθινῆς θυσίας καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἑσπερινήν. *De victimis offerentibus*, sec. iv. (Mang. ii. 254): οὐ γὰρ ἐφίεται τὴν ὀλόκαυτον θυσίαν ἔξω προσαγαγεῖν, πρὶν ἔνδον περὶ βαθὺν ὄρθρον ἐπιθυμῶσαι. Still more precise is the statement of the Mishna (*Joma* iii. 5), to the effect that “the offering of the morning incense took place between the sprinkling of the blood and the offering of the various parts of the victim; while the corresponding evening one occurred between the offering of these portions and the drink-offering.”

²⁴⁸ On the assembling of the people in the temple for prayer, see Luke i. 10; Acts iii. 1. For more precise information, as furnished by the tractate *Tamid*, see below. It is quite a mistake to suppose, as has been done through a misapprehension of Acts ii. 15, iii. 1, x. 3, 9, 30, that the third, sixth, and ninth hours of the day (therefore, according to our reckoning, nine, twelve, and three o'clock) were regular stated times for prayer (so, for example, Schoettgen, *Horae hebr.* i. 418. Winer's *Realwörterb.* i. 398. De Wette's note on Acts ii. 15; and Meyer's on Acts iii. 1). The actual times for prayer were rather the three following:—(1) early in the

psalm for every day of the week, the one for Sunday being the 24th, for Monday the 48th, for Tuesday the 82nd, for Wednesday the 94th, for Thursday the 81st, for Friday the 93rd, and for the Sabbath the 92nd.²⁴⁹

The form of the daily service in the temple which we have just been describing, is the same as that which had been

morning, at the time of the morning sacrifice; (2) in the afternoon, about the ninth hour (three o'clock), at the time of the evening sacrifice; and (3) in the evening at sunset. See *Berachoth* i. 1 ff., iv. 1. Herzfeld's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. p. 183 ff. Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. für Bibel u. Talmud*, 2nd part, arts. "Morgengebet," "Minchagebet," "Abendgebet."

²⁴⁹ *Tamid* vii. fin. Further, Lundius, *Die alt. jud. Heiligh.* book iv. chap. v. no. 25. Herzfeld's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 163 f. Grätz, *Die Tempel psalmen* (*Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wissens. des Judenth.* 1878, pp. 217-222). Delitzsch's *Commentar zu den Psalmen*. In the case of five of the psalms here in question the Sept. also inserts in the title of each a correct statement of the particular day on which it was to be sung, thus: Ps. xxiv. (xxiii.), τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτου; xlviii. (xlvii.), δευτέρᾳ σαββάτου; xciv. (xciii.), τετάρτῃ σαββάτου; xciii. (xcii.), εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ προσαββάτου, ὅτε κατέκισται ἡ γῆ; xcii. (xci.), εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ σαββάτου. As regards the psalm for the Sabbath, the statement to the effect that it was the one appointed for that day has forced its way even into the Masoretic text. It has been alleged that the Jews were led to select those particular psalms from an idea that they presented suitable parallels to the six creative days (see *Rosh hashana* xxxi.^a; *Soferim* xviii. 1; the commentaries of Bartenora and Maimonides in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, vol. v. p. 310). But in the majority of the psalms in question it is quite impossible to discover any such parallelism. This view has obviously been suggested by the circumstance that when the "station" of Israelites assembled in the synagogue to read a portion of the Scripture (as described at p. 275 f. above), it was so arranged that in the course of the week the entire account of the creation should be read through consecutively (*Taanith* iv. 3: On the first day of the week they read the account of the first and second days' work; on the second day of the week, that of the second and third days' work, and so on). Besides the psalms for the different days of the week, many others, of course, were used in the services of the temple on the most divers occasions. Thus, on the high festival days, for example, the so-called *Hallel* was sung, i.e. according to the ordinary view, Ps. cxiii.-cxviii.; at the same time the traditions would seem to be somewhat undecided as to what we are to understand by the *Hallel*; see Buxtorf's *Lex. Chald.* col. 613-616 (under הלל). Lightfoot's *Horae hebr.*, note on Luke xiii. 35 (*Opp.* ii. p. 538 f.). Lundius' note on *Taanith* iii. 9 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. p. 377). Grätz, *Monatsschr.* 1879, pp. 202 ff., 241 ff. Levy's *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* under הלל. Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. für Bibel und Talmud*, 2nd part, art. "Hallel."

already delineated with so much fondness by the son of Sirach (Sir. l. 11-21). A very circumstantial account of the *morning* service, founded evidently on sound tradition, is given in the Mishna in the tractate *Tamid*, the substance of which may here be subjoined by way of supplement to what we have already said.²⁵⁰

The officiating priests slept in a room in the inner court. Early in the morning, even before daybreak, the official who had charge of the lots for deciding how the different functions for the day were to be apportioned came, and, in the first place, caused a lot to be drawn to determine who was to perform the duty of removing the ashes from the altar of burnt-offering. Those who were disposed to offer themselves for this task were expected to have taken the bath prescribed by the law previous to the arrival of the above-mentioned official. The lots were then drawn, and one of those who thus presented themselves was in this way told off to perform the duty in question. This person then set to work at once while it was still dark, and with no light but that of the altar fire. The first thing he did was to wash his hands and feet in the brazen laver that stood between the temple and the altar, after which he mounted the altar and carried away the ashes with a silver pan. While this was being done, those whose duty it was to prepare the baked meat-offering (of the high priest) were also busy with their particular function.²⁵¹ Meanwhile fresh wood was laid upon the altar, and, while this was burning, the priests after they had all in like manner washed their hands and feet in the brazen laver, went up to the *lischkath ha-gasith* (on this see

²⁵⁰ The tractate in question is to be found in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, vol. v. pp. 284-310; and in Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. xix. col. 1467-1502. The principal passages along with other material also in Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. xiii. 942-1055. There is a good edition of the tractate by itself (and, as in the case of those already mentioned, also furnished with a Latin translation and notes), under the title, *Tractatus Talmudicus de cultu quotidiano templi, quem versione Latina donatum et notis illustratum . . . sub praesidio Dn. Conradi Ikenii patris sui . . . eruditorum examini subicit auctor Conradus Iken*, Braemae 1736.

²⁵¹ *Tamid* i. 1-4. Comp. *Joma* i. 8, ii. 1-2.

p. 191, above), where the further drawing of the lots took place.²⁵³

The official who had charge of this matter then caused lots to be drawn in order to determine—(1) who was to slaughter the victim; (2) who was to sprinkle the blood upon the altar; (3) who was to remove the ashes from the altar of incense; (4) who was to trim the lamps on the candlestick; further, who were to carry the various portions of the victim to the foot of the ascent to the altar, viz. who (5) was to carry the head and one of the hind legs; (6) who the two forelegs; (7) who the tail and the other hind leg; (8) who the breast and the neck; (9) who the two sides; (10) who the entrails; (11) who the offering of fine flour; (12) who the baked meat-offering (of the high priest); and (13) who the wine for the drink-offering.²⁵³ The next step was to go out to see whether there was as yet any symptom of daybreak. Then as soon as the dawn appeared in the sky they proceeded to bring a lamb from the lamb-house and the ninety-three sacred utensils from the utensil-room. The lamb that was thus to form the victim had now some water given to it from a golden bowl, whereupon it was led away to the slaughtering place on the north side of the altar.²⁵⁴ Meanwhile the two whose duty it was to clean the altar of incense and trim the lamps proceeded to the temple, the former with a golden pail (פֶּיִי) and the latter with a golden bottle (בִּיָּה). They opened the great door of the temple, went in, and proceeded, the one to clean the altar of incense, and the other to trim the lamps. In the case of the latter however the arrangement was, that if the two that were farthest east were found to be still burning they were in the meantime to be left undisturbed, and only the other five were to be trimmed. But should it so happen that the two that were farthest east were out, then *they* were, in the first place, to be trimmed and relighted before the trimming of the others was proceeded with. And so having finished

²⁵³ *Tamid* ii. 1-5.

²⁵³ *Tamid* iii. 1; *Joma* ii. 8.

²⁵⁴ *Tamid* iii. 2-5; comp. *Joma* iii. 1-2.

their task, the two priests now retired, but they left behind them in the temple the utensils which they had been using.²⁵⁵

While the two just referred to were thus occupied within the temple, the lamb was being slaughtered at the slaughtering place by the priest to whose lot this duty had fallen, another at the same time catching up the blood and sprinkling it upon the altar. The victim was then flayed and cut up into a number of pieces. The entrails were washed upon marble tables that were at hand for the purpose. There were whole *six* priests appointed to carry the pieces to the altar, one piece being borne by each priest. Then a *seventh* carried the offering of fine flour, an *eighth* the baked meat-offering (of the high priest), and a *ninth* the wine for the drink-offering. All the things here mentioned were in the first instance laid down on the west side of the ascent to the altar and at the foot of it, and then seasoned with salt, whereupon the priests betook themselves once more to the *lischkath ha-gasith* for the purpose of repeating the schma.²⁵⁶

After they had repeated the schma, the lots were again drawn. In the first instance they were drawn among those who as yet had not been called upon to offer up incense in order to determine which one amongst them should now be entrusted with this duty.²⁵⁷ Then another was drawn to determine who were to lay the various parts of the victim upon the altar (which, if we are to believe Rabbi Elieser ben Jacob, was

²⁵⁵ *Tamid* iii. 6-9. For an exposition of *Tamid* iii. 6, comp. further, Grätz, *Monatsschr.* 1880, p. 289 ff.

²⁵⁶ *Tamid* iv. 1-3. For the place where the pieces were laid down, see also *Shekalim* viii. 8. According to *Shekalim* vi. 4, there was a marble table for this purpose standing on the west side of the ascent to the altar. On the salting of the pieces, see Lev. ii. 13; Ezek. xliii. 24; Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 9. 1.

²⁵⁷ The offering of the incense was regarded as the most solemn stage in the whole sacrificial act. See Philo, *De victimis offerentibus*, sec. iv. (Mangey, ii. 254): "Ὅσα γάρ, ὄμαι, λίθων μὲν ἀμείνων χρυσός, τὰ δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς τῶν ἐκτὸς ἀγιώτερα, τοσοῦτ' ἀρείττων ἢ διὰ τῶν ἐπιθυμιωμένων εὐχαριστία τῆς διὰ τῶν ἐναλίμων. Hence it was while they were offering the incense above all that revelations were made to the priests, as for example in the case of John Hyrcanus (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 10. 3) and that of Zacharias (Luke i. 9-20).

done by the same priests who had formerly carried them to the foot of the altar). Those on whom no lot fell upon this occasion were now free to go away, and accordingly they took off their official attire.²⁵⁸

The priest to whose lot the duty of offering the incense had fallen now went and took a golden saucer (קֶבֶץ) covered with a lid, and inside of which again there was a smaller saucer (קֶבֶץ קָטָן) containing the incense.²⁵⁹ Another priest took a silver pan (מִזְבֵּחַ), and with it brought some live coal from the altar of burnt-offering and then emptied it into a golden pan.²⁶⁰ This being done, both entered the temple together. The one emptied the coals that were in his pan on to the altar of incense, prostrated himself in an attitude of devotion, and then withdrew. The other took the smaller saucer containing the incense out of the larger one, then handing this latter to a third priest, he emptied the incense out of the saucer on to the coals upon the altar, whereupon it ascended in clouds of smoke. This being done, he, like the other, fell down in an attitude of devotion, and then left the temple. But, previous to these latter having entered, the two who had charge of the cleaning of the altar of incense and the trimming of the lamps had also come back and entered for the second time, the former merely to bring away his utensils (the מִזְבֵּחַ), the latter in like manner to bring away his (the מִזְבֵּחַ), but also for the additional purpose of trimming the more easterly of the two lamps that had not yet been so; the other being allowed still to burn in order that with it the others might be lighted in the evening. If it, too, happened to be out, then it was trimmed like the others, and lighted with fire taken from the altar of burnt-offering.²⁶¹

²⁵⁸ *Tamid* v. 1-3. Comp. *Joma* ii. 4-5.

²⁵⁹ That the lid belonged to the קֶבֶץ and not to the מִזְבֵּחַ may be seen from *Tamid* vii. 2; as also from its being assumed that possibly some of the incense might fall from the מִזְבֵּחַ when it was full into the קֶבֶץ, *Tamid* vi. 3.

²⁶⁰ *Tamid* v. 4-5. On the gold and silver pan, as well as the incense itself, comp. further *Joma* iv. 4.

²⁶¹ *Tamid* vi. 1-3. According to this account from the Mishna, it

The five priests who had been thus occupied inside the sanctuary now proceeded with their five golden utensils in their hands to the steps in front of the temple, and there pronounced the priestly benediction over the people, in the course of which the name of God was pronounced as it spells (therefore יהוה, not אדוני).²⁶²

And now, at this point, the offering of the burnt-offering was proceeded with, the priests who had been appointed to this duty taking up the portions of the victim that lay at the foot of the ascent to the altar, and after placing their hands upon them, throwing them on to the altar.²⁶³ In those cases in which the high priest officiated, he caused the pieces to be given to him by the ordinary priests, and then placing his hands upon them he threw them on to the altar. And now, in the last place, the two meat-offerings (that of the people and that of the high priest) and the drink-offering were presented. When the priest was bending forward to pour out the drink-offering a signal was given to the Levites to proceed with the music. They accordingly broke in with the singing of the psalm, and at every pause in the music two priests blew with silver trumpets, and every time they blew the people all fell down and prayed.²⁶⁴

appears that only *one* of the seven lamps of the candlestick was kept burning during the day, and that the middle one of the three on the east side. According, on the other hand, to what must be regarded as the more important testimony of Josephus, it was usual to have three lamps burning in the day-time; see p. 281, above. On the whole controversy as to which and how many lamps burnt during the day, see also Iken, *Tractatus Talmudicus de cultu quotidiano templi* (1736), pp. 73-76, 107 f.

²⁶² *Tamid* vii. 2.

²⁶³ The throwing required a special dexterity on the part of the priests, a dexterity of which Pseudo-Aristeas already speaks in terms of admiration (Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 112; Merx' *Archiv*, i. 271).

²⁶⁴ *Tamid* vii. 3. Towards the close this tractate becomes somewhat less detailed. It only describes the mode of offering the sacrifice in those cases in which the high priest himself officiated. Besides, the offering of the two meat-offerings is not expressly mentioned. That we have inserted them in their proper place it is impossible to doubt, if we may judge from the order in which they are introduced elsewhere (*Tamid* iii. 1, iv. *fin.*). Consequently, the meat-offering of the high priest was *not* offered before that

The *evening* service was exactly similar to the morning one, which has just been described. The only difference was that in the former the incense was offered *after* the burnt-offering instead of before it, while in the evening again the lamps were not trimmed, but simply lighted (see p. 290 f. above).

Those two daily public sacrifices formed the substratum of the entire worship of the temple. They were also offered, and that in the manner we have described, on *every Sabbath and every festival day*. But with the view of distinguishing them above ordinary occasions, it was the practice on those days to add further public offerings to the ordinary tamid. The addition on the Sabbath consisted of two male lambs of a year old, which were offered as a burnt-offering along with two-tenths of an ephah of fine flour as a meat-offering, and a corresponding amount of wine as a drink-offering. Consequently the sacrifices offered at a single service on the Sabbath would be exactly equivalent to the daily morning and evening sacrifices put together.²⁶⁵ On *festival days* again the additional offerings were on a still more extensive scale. On the occasion of the *feast of the Passover*, for example, there were offered as a burnt-offering, and that *daily* during the whole seven days over which the festival extended, two young bullocks, a ram, and seven lambs, along with the corresponding meat- and drink-offerings, and in addition to all this, a he-goat as a sin-offering (Num. xxviii. 16–25); and on the *feast of Weeks* again, which lasted of the people, as Heb. vii. 27 might lead us to suppose, but *after* it. See also Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heiligth.* book iii. chap. xxxix. no. 58.

²⁶⁵ Num. xxviii. 9, 10. Philo, *De victimis*, sec. iii. (Mang. ii. 239): Ταῖς δὲ ἑβδόμαϊς διπλασιάζει τὸν τῶν ἱερῶν ἀριθμὸν. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 10. 1. κατὰ δὲ ἑβδόμην ἡμέραν, ἥτις σάββατα καλεῖται, δύο σφάζουσι, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἱερουργοῦντες. The prescriptions in Ezek. xlv. 4, 5 are essentially different from this. But the main difference between pre- and post-exilic times, as regards both the festival sacrifices and the tamid alike, lay in this, that *previous to the exile the king* was called upon to defray the cost of them, whereas *after the exile* they were provided at the expense of the *people themselves*. See in particular, Ezek. xlv. 17; and in general, Ezek. xlv. 18, xlv. 15. For an account of the form of worship observed on the Sabbath, see Lundius, *Die alt. jüd. Heiligth.* book v. chap. v.

only one day, there were offered the same sacrifices as on each of the seven days of the feast of the Passover (Num. xxviii. 26-31). Then on the occasion of the *feast of Tabernacles*, which, as being the festival that took place when the harvest was over, would naturally be celebrated with special tokens of thankfulness, the number of sacrifices was much greater still. On the first day of this feast there were offered, as a burnt-offering, thirteen young bullocks, two rams, and fourteen lambs, along with the corresponding meat- and drink-offerings, and over and above all this a he-goat as a sin-offering; while on each of the six following festival days, all those sacrifices were repeated, with this difference, that every day there was one bullock fewer than on the preceding day (Num. xxix. 12-34). Similar supplementary sacrifices and offerings, at one time on a larger at another on a smaller scale, were also prescribed for the other festivals (the new moon, the new year, and the great day of atonement) that occurred in the course of the year (see in general, Num. xxviii.-xxix.). Then to those sacrifices which merely served to indicate in a general way the festive character of the occasions on which they were offered, there were further added those special ones that had reference to the peculiar significance of the feast (on this see Lev. xvi. and xxiii.).

But copious as those *public sacrifices* no doubt were, they still seem but few when compared with the multitudes of *private* offerings and sacrifices that were offered. It was the vast number of these latter—so vast in fact as to be well-nigh inconceivable—that gave its peculiar stamp to the worship at Jerusalem. Here day after day whole crowds of victims were slaughtered and whole masses of flesh burnt; and when any of the high festivals came round, there was such a host of sacrifices to dispose of that it was scarcely possible to attend to them all notwithstanding the fact that there were thousands of priests officiating on the occasion.²⁶⁶ But the people of

²⁶⁶ Aristeas (in Haverkamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 112. Merx' *Archiv*, i. 270. 5, 6): Πολλὰ γὰρ μυρία κτηνῶν προσάγονται κατὰ τὰς τῶν ἑορτῶν

Israel saw in the punctilious observance of this worship the principal means of securing for themselves the favour of their God.

APPENDIX.

PARTICIPATION OF GENTILES IN THE WORSHIP AT JERUSALEM.

Considering the wall of rigid separation which, as regards matters of religion, the Jews had erected between themselves and the Gentiles, it would not readily occur to one that these latter were also permitted to take part in the worship at Jerusalem. And yet that such was the case is a fact as well authenticated as any fact could be. Nor are we thinking here of the large body of *proselytes*, i.e. of those Gentiles who, to some extent, professed their adherence to the *faith* of Israel, and who on this account testified their reverence for Israel's God by sacrificing to Him. No, we have in view such as were real Gentiles, and who, in sacrificing at Jerusalem, would by no means care to acknowledge that in so doing they were professing their belief in the *superstitio Judaica*. There is however but one way of understanding this singular fact, and that is by reflecting how formal and superficial the connection often is, in practical life, between *faith* and *worship*,—a connection that originally was of so very intimate a character,—and also how this was peculiarly the case at the period now in question. The presenting of a sacrifice with a view to its being offered in some famous sanctuary was very often nothing more than an expression, on the part of the offerer, of a cosmopolitan piety, nay, in many instances a mere act of

ἡμέρας. Philo, *Vita Mosis*, iii. 19, *init.*: Πολλῶν τε κατὰ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον ἀναγομένων θυσιῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, καὶ διαφερόντως ἐν πανηγύρεσι καὶ ἱορταῖς ὑπὲρ τε ἰδίας ἑκάστου καὶ κοινῇ ὑπὲρ πάντων διὰ μυρίας καὶ οὐχὶ τὰς αὐτὰς αἰτίας κ.τ.λ. Comp. the numbers given in 1 Kings viii. 63; 1 Chron. xxix. 21; 2 Chron. xxix. 32 f., xxx. 24, xxxv. 7-9.

courtesy toward a particular people or a particular city, and not in the least intended to be regarded as indicating the man's religious creed. And if this was a thing that occurred in the case of famous sanctuaries elsewhere, why should it not take place at Jerusalem as well? There was no reason why the Jewish people and their priests should discountenance an act intended to do honour to their God, even though it were purely an act of politeness. As for the offering of the sacrifice, that was really the priests' affair; it was for them to see that this was gone about in proper and due form. And if the sacrifice were provided, there did not seem to be any particular reason for caring at whose expense it was so. In any case the Jew was not called upon, through any religious scruple, to decline a gift of this nature even from one who did not otherwise yield obedience to the law. And accordingly we find the Old Testament itself proceeding on the assumption that a sacrifice might be legitimately offered even by a Gentile (פֶּן יִנָּכֵר).²⁶⁷ And so the Judaism of later times has also carefully specified what kinds of sacrifices might be accepted from a Gentile and what might not: for example, all were to be accepted that were offered in consequence of a vow or as freewill offerings (all נִדְבֹת and נִרְיִים); while, on the other hand, those of an obligatory character, such as sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, and those presented by those who had issues, and by women after child-birth and such like, could not be offered by Gentiles.²⁶⁸ The offerings therefore which these latter were permitted to present were burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, and drink-offerings.²⁶⁹ Hence it is, that in enumerating the special legal prescriptions relating to offerings, there

²⁶⁷ Lev. xxii. 25 and Dillmann's note. It is here stated that it would be *unlawful* to take blemished animals for victims even from a Gentile, which presupposes, of course, that, generally speaking, Gentiles might lawfully present sacrifices.

²⁶⁸ *Shekalim* i. 5.

²⁶⁹ Thank- or peace-offerings they were debarred from presenting, for the simple reason that they would not possess the Levitical purity required of those who, in this instance, partook of the flesh of the victims at the sacrificial feast (Lev. vii. 20, 21).

is frequently a reference, at the same time, to the sacrifices of the Gentiles as well.²⁷⁰

The general fact, that sacrifices were offered by and in the name of Gentiles, is one that is vouched for in the most explicit way possible by Josephus, who informs us that on the occasion of the breaking out of the revolution in the year 6 A.D., precisely one of the first things done was to pass a resolution declaring that it was no longer lawful to take sacrifices from Gentiles.²⁷¹ By way of protesting against such a proceeding, the opposite conservative party took care to point out that "all their forefathers had been in the habit of receiving sacrifices at the hands of Gentiles;" and that if the Jews were to be the only people among whom a foreigner was not to be allowed to sacrifice, then Jerusalem would incur the reproach of being an ungodly city.²⁷² History records at least several remarkable instances of the matter now in question. When we are told, for example, that *Alexander the Great* once sacrificed at Jerusalem,²⁷³ the truth of this fact no doubt depends on how far it is historically true that this monarch ever visited that city at all. But be this as it may, the simple fact of such a thing being even recorded goes to prove that Judaism looked upon such a proceeding as perfectly legitimate and proper. Then *Ptolemaeus III.* is likewise alleged to have offered sacrifices at Jerusalem.²⁷⁴ Again, *Antiochus VII. (Sidetes)*, while he was at open feud with the Jews and was in the very act of besieging Jerusalem, went so far as, on the occasion of the feast of Tabernacles, to send sacrifices into the city, presumably with the view of disposing the God of the enemy in his favour, while the Jews on their part cordially

²⁷⁰ *Shekalim* vii. 6; *Sebachim* iv. 5; *Menachoth* v. 3, 5, 6, vi. 1, ix. 8. Comp. further, *Hamburger's Real-Encycl. für Bibel u. Talmud*, 2nd part, art. "Opfer der Heiden."

²⁷¹ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 2-4.

²⁷² *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 4: ὅτι πάντες οἱ πρόγονοι τὰς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλογενῶν θυσίας ἀπεδέχοντο. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 3: καταψηφίσασθαι τῆς πόλεως ἀσέβειαν, εἰ παρὰ μόνοις Ἰουδαίοις οὔτε θύσει τις ἀλλότριος οὔτε προσκυνήσει.

²⁷³ *Joseph. Antt.* xi. 8. 5.

²⁷⁴ *Joseph. contra Apion.* ii. 5, *init.*

welcomed the sacrifices as a token of the king's sympathy with their faith.²⁷⁵ Further, when *Marcus Agrippa*, the distinguished patron of Herod, came to Jerusalem in the year 15 B.C., he there sacrificed a hecatomb, consequently a burnt-offering consisting of no fewer than a hundred oxen.²⁷⁶ Once more, Josephus tells us with regard to *Vitellius*, that he came to Jerusalem at the Passover season in the year 37 A.D., for the purpose of offering sacrifice to God.²⁷⁷ How frequent such acts of courtesy or cosmopolitan piety were may be further seen from the circumstance that Augustus expressly commended his grandson Caius Caesar, because on his way from Egypt to Syria he did not stay to worship in Jerusalem.²⁷⁸ Tertullian is therefore perfectly justified in saying that once upon a time the Romans had even honoured the God of the Jews by offering Him sacrifice, and their temple by bestowing presents upon it.²⁷⁹ Nor are we to suppose that it is merely proselytes that are in view when Josephus describes the altar at Jerusalem as "the altar venerated by all Greeks and barbarians,"²⁸⁰ and says of the place on which the temple stood, that it "is adored by the whole world, and for its renown is honoured among strangers at the ends of the earth."²⁸¹

In the class of sacrifices offered for and in the name of Gentiles should also be included *the sacrifice for the Gentile authorities*. As previous to the exile the Israelitish kings were in the habit of defraying the cost of the public sacrifices,

²⁷⁵ *Antt.* xiii. 8. 2.

²⁷⁶ *Antt.* xvi. 2. 1. Sacrifices on so large a scale as this were nothing unusual in the temple at Jerusalem. See Ezra vi. 17. Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, sec. xlv. (Mang. ii. 598). *Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 576, 626.

²⁷⁷ *Antt.* xviii. 5. 3.

²⁷⁸ Sueton. *August.* cap. xciii.: Gajum nepotem, quod Judaeam prae-tervehens apud Hierosolyma non supplicasset, conlaudavit.

²⁷⁹ Tertullian, *Apologet.* cap. xxvi.: Cujus (Judaeae) et deum victimis et templum donis et gentem foederibus aliquamdiu Romani honorastis.

²⁸⁰ *Bell. Jud.* v. 1. 3: τὸν Ἑλλήσι πᾶσι καὶ βαρβάροις σεβάσμιον βωμόν.

²⁸¹ *Bell. Jud.* iv. 4. 3 (ed. Bekker, v. 815. 2-4): ὁ ἱεὺς ὑπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης προσκυνοῦμενος, ἡ πόλις καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ περὶ τὴν γῆς ἀλλοφύλοις ἀκοῇ τετιμημένος.

so Cyrus in like manner is said to have given orders that whatever means and materials might be required for this purpose should be furnished out of the royal exchequer, at the same time however with the view of prayer being offered "for the life of the king and his sons" (Ezra vi. 10). The fact of a sacrifice being specially offered in behalf of the sovereign (ὀλοκαύτωσις προσφερομένη ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλέως) is further confirmed by still more explicit testimony belonging to the time of the Maccabæan movement (1 Macc. vii. 33). Consequently we see that even then, at a time when a great proportion of the people was waging war with the king of Syria, the priests were still conscientiously offering the sacrifice that, as we may venture to suppose, had been founded by the Syrian kings themselves. In the Roman period again this sacrifice, offered on behalf of the Gentile authorities, was precisely the only possible form under which Judaism could furnish something like an equivalent for that worship of the emperor and of Rome that went on throughout all the other provinces. We learn indeed from the explicit testimony of Philo, that *Augustus himself* ordained that, in all time coming, two lambs and a bullock were to be sacrificed every day at the emperor's expense.²⁸² It was to this sacrifice offered "*in behalf of the emperor and the Roman people*" that the Jews expressly pointed in the time of Caligula, when their loyalty happened to be called in question in consequence of their having opposed the erection of the emperor's statue in the temple.²⁸³ And we are further informed that it continued to

²⁸² Philo, *Leg. ad Cajum*, sec. xxiii. (ed. Mang. ii. 569) : προστάζας καὶ δι' αἰῶνος ἀνάγεσθαι θυσίας ἐνδελεχεῖς ὀλοκαύτους καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων προσόδων, ἀπαρχὴν τῷ ὑψίστῳ θεῷ, αἱ καὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ἐπιτελοῦνται καὶ εἰς ἅπαν ἐπιτελεσθήσονται. He also uses terms almost identical with these in sec. xl., ed. Mang. ii. 592, where however he adds the remark, that ἄρνες εἰσι δύο καὶ ταῦρος τὰ ἱερῆα, οἷς Καῖσαρ ἐφῆδρυνε [i. ἐφῆδρυνε] τὸν βαμὸν.

²⁸³ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 10. 4: Ἰουδαῖοι περὶ μὲν Καίσαρος καὶ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ῥωμαίων δις τῆς ἡμέρας θύειν ἔφασαν. From the conclusion of this sentence we see that, like the public sacrifices, the daily sacrifice for the emperor was also offered partly in the morning and partly in the evening.

be regularly offered down till the time when the revolution broke out in the year 66 A.D.²⁸⁴ Then we have it, on the authority of Philo, that it was not merely a sacrifice *for* the emperor, but one that had been also instituted *by* him; a step which, in spite of his strong antipathy to Judaism, Augustus would probably deem it prudent to take from political considerations. It is true, no doubt, that Josephus affirms that the expenses connected with the sacrifice now in question were defrayed by the Jewish people themselves.²⁸⁵ Possibly however this historian himself was not at the time aware that the money to pay for the sacrifice came actually from the emperor. At the same time it would appear that, on special occasions, very large sacrifices were offered in behalf of the emperor at the public expense; as, for example, in the time of Caligula, when a hecatomb was offered on each of three different occasions, first on the occasion of that emperor's accession to the throne, then on that of his recovery from a serious illness, and lastly at the commencement of his campaign in Germany.²⁸⁶

Besides offering sacrifices, it was also very common for Gentiles to bestow gifts upon the temple at Jerusalem. Pseudo-Aristeas, for example, gives a very minute account of the splendid presents which Ptolemaeus Philadelphus gave to

²⁸⁴ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 2-4.

²⁸⁵ Joseph. *contra Apion.* ii. 6, *fin.*: Facimus autem pro eis (scil. imperatoribus et populo Romano) continua sacrificia; et non solum quotidianis diebus ex impensa communi omnium Judaeorum talia celebramus, verum quum nullas alias hostias ex communi neque pro filiis peragamus, solis imperatoribus hunc honorem praecipuum pariter exhibemus, quem hominum nulli persolvimus.

²⁸⁶ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, sec. xlv. (ed. Mang. ii. 598). Sacrifice and prayer in behalf of the Gentile authorities is recommended generally in Jer. xxix. 7; Bar. i. 10, 11. *Aboth* iii. 2: "Rabbi Chananiah, president of the priests, said: Pray for the welfare of the higher authorities" (מלכות meaning here the Gentile authorities). For the *Christian* practice, comp. 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2. *Clemens Romanus*, lxi.; and in addition, the material collected by Harnack (*Patrum apostol. opp.* i. 1, ed. 2, 1876, p. 103 f.). Mangold, *De ecclesia primaeva pro Caesaribus ac magistratibus Romanis preces fundente*, 1881.

the temple on the occasion of his requesting the Jewish high priest to send him a number of persons who would be sufficiently competent to take part in a translation of the Old Testament into Greek, the articles presented being twenty golden and thirty silver cups, five goblets, and a golden table of elaborate workmanship.²⁸⁷ Although this story may belong to the realm of the legendary, still it may be regarded as faithfully reflecting the practice of the time. For, apart from this, we have it vouched for elsewhere over and over again that the Ptolemies frequently gave presents to the temple of Jerusalem.²⁸⁸ Nor was it different in the Roman period. When *Sosius*, in conjunction with Herod, had succeeded in conquering Jerusalem, he presented a golden crown.²⁸⁹ *Marcus Agrippa* too, on the occasion of his visit to Jerusalem to which we have already referred, presented gifts for the further embellishment of the temple.²⁹⁰ Among the vessels of the temple which John of Gischala caused to be melted during the siege were the wine goblets (*ἀκρατοφόροι*) that had been presented by *Augustus* and his consort.²⁹¹ Altogether it was not in the least unusual for Romans to dedicate gifts to the temple.²⁹² And so, strange to say, in this way even the exclusive temple of Jerusalem became in a certain sense cosmopolitan; it too received the homage of the whole world in common with the more celebrated sanctuaries of heathendom.

²⁸⁷ Pseudo-Aristeas in Havercamp's edition of *Josephus*, ii. 2. 108–111 (also in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 262–269); in the citation as given in *Antt.* xiii. 3. 4; *contra Apion.* ii. 5, *init.*

²⁸⁸ 2 Macc. iii. 2, v. 16. *Joseph. Antt.* xiii. 3. 4; *contra Apion.* ii. 5, *init.*

²⁸⁹ *Antt.* xiv. 16. 4.

²⁹⁰ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, sec. xxxvii., ed. Mang. ii. 589.

²⁹¹ *Bell. Jud.* v. 13. 6. Comp. Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, sec. xxiii., ed. Mang. ii. 569.

²⁹² *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 10 (Bekker, v. 305. 20 f.). Comp. ii. 17. 3.

§ 25. SCRIBISM.

I. CANONICAL DIGNITY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.¹

THE fact most essentially conclusive for the religious life of the Jewish people during the period under consideration is, that the law, which regulated not only the priestly service but the whole life of the people in their religious, moral and social relations, was acknowledged as given by God Himself. Its every requirement was a requirement of God from His people, its most scrupulous observance was therefore a religious duty, nay the supreme and in truth the sole religious duty. The whole piety of the Israelite consisted in obeying with fear and trembling, with all the zeal of an anxious conscience, the law given him by God in all its particulars. Hence the specific character of Israelitish piety during this period depends on the acknowledgment of this dignity of the law.

The age of this acknowledgment may be determined almost to the day and hour. It dates from that important occurrence, whose epoch-making importance is duly brought forward in the Book of Nehemiah, the reading of the law by Ezra, and the solemn engagement of the people to observe it (Neh. viii.-x.). The law, which was then read, was the Pentateuch in essentially the same form as we now have it. Isolated passages may have been subsequently interpolated, but with respect to the main substance, these need not be taken account of. Henceforward then *the law given by God through Moses was acknowledged by the people as the binding rule of life, i.e. as canonical*. For it is in the very nature of the

¹ See the literature on the history of the Old Test. canon in Strack, art. "Kanon des A. T.," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* vol. vii. 2nd ed. (1880) p. 450 sq.; and in Schmiedel, art. "Kanon," in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgem. Encyclopädie*, § 2, vol. xxxii. (1882) p. 335 sq.

law that its acceptance *eo ipso* involves the acknowledgment of its binding and normative dignity.² Hence this acknowledgment was from that time onwards a self-evident assumption to every Israelite. It was the condition without which no one was a member of the chosen people, or could have a share in the promises given to them. "He who asserts that the Torah is not from heaven (אין תורה מן השמים), has no part in the future world."^{2a} It is however in the nature of the thing that this notion should, as time went on, be held with increasing strictness and severity. While its original meaning was only that the *commands* of the law were in their entirety and in their details the commands of God, the assumption of a divine origin was gradually referred to the entire Pentateuch according to its whole wording. "He who says that Moses wrote even one verse of his own knowledge (מפי עצמו) is a denier and despiser of the word of God."³ The whole Pentateuch was thus now regarded as dictated by God, as prompted by the Spirit of God.⁴ Even the last eight verses of Deuteronomy, in which the death of Moses is related, were said to have been written by Moses himself by means of divine revelation.⁵ Nay at last, the view of a divine dictation was no longer sufficient. The complete book of the law was declared to have been handed to Moses by God, and it was only disputed, whether God delivered the whole Torah to Moses at once or by volumes (מגלה מגלה).⁶

After the law and as an addition to it, certain other writings of Israelite antiquity, *the writings of the prophets and works on the older* (pre-exilian) *history of Israel*, attained to similar

² Comp. Wellhausen, *Geschichte Israels*, i. 2 sq., 425 sq.

^{2a} *Sanhedrin* x. 1.

³ *Bab. Sanhedrin* 99a.

⁴ See in general, Joh. Delitzsch, *De inspiratione scripturae sacrae quid statuerint patres apostolici et apologetae secundi saeculi* (Lips. 1872), pp. 4-8, 14-17.

⁵ *Baba bathra* 15a (lat. in Marx, *Traditio rabbinorum veterrima de librorum Vet. Test. ordine atque origine*, Lips. 1884, p. 23). Philo, *Vita Mosis*, iii. 39 (ed. Mang. ii. 179). Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 8. 48.

⁶ *Gittin* 60a.

authority. They were for a long time respected and used as a valuable legacy of antiquity, before their canonization was thought of. Gradually however they appeared beside the law as a second class of "sacred Scriptures," and the longer their combination with the law became customary, the more was its specific, *i.e.* its legally binding dignity, and therefore its canonical validity, transferred to them. They too were regarded as documents in which the will of God was revealed in a manner absolutely binding. Lastly, at a still later stage there was added to this body of the "prophets" (נביאים) a *third collection* of "writings" (כתובים), which gradually entered into the same category of canonical Scriptures. The origin of these two collections is quite veiled in obscurity. The most ancient testimony to the collocation of *both* collections with the Thorah is the prologue to the Book of Wisdom (second century B.C.).⁷ We cannot, however, determine from it that the third collection was then already concluded; on the other hand, it is very probable that in the time of Josephus the canon had already assumed a lasting form, and indeed the same which it has to this day. Josephus expressly says, that there were among the Jews only twenty-two books acknowledged divine (βιβλία . . . θεία πεπιστευμένα); that all the others were not esteemed of equal credit (πίστεως οὐχ ὁμοίας ἡξίωται). He does not, indeed, separately enumerate them, but it is very probable that he means by them the collected writings of the present canon, and these only. For the Fathers, especially Origen and Jerome, expressly say, that the Jews were accustomed so to count the books of the present canon as to make their number twenty-two.⁸ It was only with respect to cer-

⁷ Prologue to Wisdom: Πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ἡμῖν διὰ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατ' αὐτοὺς ἠκολουθηκότων δεδομένων, ὑπὲρ ὧν δῖον ἐστὶν ἐπαινεῖν τὸν Ἰσραὴλ παιδείας καὶ σοφίας κ.τ.λ.

⁸ Joseph. *contra Apion.* i. 8: Οὐ γὰρ μυριάδες βιβλίων εἰσι παρ' ἡμῖν ἀσυμφώνων καὶ μαχομένων, δύο δὲ μόνα πρὸς τοῖς εἴκοσι βιβλία, τοῦ παντός ἔχοντα χρόνον τὴν ἀναγραφὴν, τὰ δικαίως θεῖα πεπιστευμένα. Καὶ τούτων πέντε μὲν ἐσὶ τὰ Μαυσείως, ἃ τοὺς τε νόμους περιέχει καὶ τὴν τῆς ἀνθρωπογενείας παράδοσιν μέχρι τῆς αὐτοῦ τελευτῆς. Οὗτος ὁ χρόνος ἀπολείπει τρισχιλίω

tain books, especially the Song of Solomon and the Book of Ecclesiastes, that opinion was not yet quite decided in the first century after Christ. Yet in respect of these also the prevailing view was already that they "defile the hands," i.e. are to be regarded as canonical books.⁹ It cannot be proved of

ὀλίγων ἐτῶν. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Μαυσοείας τελευτῆς μέχρι τῆς Ἀρταξέρξου τοῦ μετὰ Ξέρξην Περσῶν βασιλείας ἀρχῆς οἱ μετὰ Μαυσὴν προφῆται τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς ποσυχθέντα συνέγραψαν ἐν τρισὶ καὶ δέκα βιβλίοις. Αἱ δὲ λοιπαὶ τέσσαρες ὕμνους εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑποθήκας τοῦ βίου περιέχουσιν. Ἀπὸ δὲ Ἀρταξέρξου μέχρι τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνου γέγραπται μὲν ἕκαστα, πίστει δὲ οὐχ ὁμοίως ἡξίωται τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν διὰ το μὴ γενέσθαι τὴν τῶν προφητῶν ἀκριβῆ διαδοχὴν. Jerome in his *Prologus galeatus to the Books of Samuel* (Opp. ed. Vallarsi, ix. 455 sq.; see the passage, e.g. in Gfrörer, *Jahrh. des Heils*, i. 237 sq., and in the introductions of De Wette, Bleek and others) gives the following enumeration as *that customary among the Jews*: (1-5) Pentateuch; (6) Joshua; (7) Judges and Ruth; (8) Samuel; (9) Kings; (10) Isaiah; (11) Jeremiah and Lamentations; (12) Ezekiel; (13) twelve minor prophets; (14) Job; (15) Psalms; (16) Proverbs; (17) Ecclesiastes; (18) Song of Solomon; (19) Daniel; (20) Chronicles; (21) Ezra and Nehemiah; (22) Esther. The same enumeration, but in a somewhat different order (and with the omission of the twelve minor prophets, which must however be an oversight of the transcriber), is given by Origen in Eusebius' *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 25 (in which the designation Ἀρμυσοφικαδεῖμ for the Book of Numbers, which is generally left unexplained, is nothing else than מִן־תַּרְגָּם שְׁמִינִי, *Joma* vii. 1; *Sota* vii. 7; *Menachoth* iv. 3). It can consequently be hardly doubtful, that Josephus also takes this enumeration for granted, and intends by his $5 + 13 + 4 = 22$ books our present canon. The four books containing "hymns of praise to God and rules of life for men," are the Psalms and the three Books of Solomon. That 1 Chron. and 2 Chron. formed, as early as the time of Christ, the closing books of the canon, may be inferred from Matt. xxiii. 35 = Luke xi. 51, where the slaying of Zachariah is mentioned as the last murder of a prophet. Chronologically viewed the death of Urijah, Jer. xxvi. 20-23, was later, but according to the order of the canon the assassination related in 2 Chronicles is certainly the last.

⁹ *Jadajim* iii. 5: "All holy Scriptures, even the *Song of Solomon* and *Ecclesiastes*, defile the hands." R. Judah says: The Song of Solomon defiles the hands, but Ecclesiastes is doubtful. R. Jose says: Ecclesiastes does not defile the hands, and the Song of Solomon is doubtful. R. Simon says: Ecclesiastes is among the points on which the school of Shammai decides in a manner to lighten, the school of Hillel in a manner to aggravate difficulty. R. Simon ben Asai said: I have received it as the tradition of the seventy-two elders, that on the day that R. Eleazar ben Asariah was named president, it was decided that the Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes defile the hands. R. Akiba said: No, no. Never has any one in Israel affirmed that the Song of Solomon did not defile the hands. For no day in the

other books than those of our present canon, that they were ever reckoned canonical by the Palestinian Jews, although the Book of Wisdom was so highly esteemed that it was sometimes cited "in a manner only customary in the case of passages of Scripture."¹⁰ It was only the Hellenistic Jews who combined a whole series of other books with those of the Hebrew canon. But then they had no definite completion of the canon at all.

Notwithstanding the combination of the *Nebiim* and *Kethu-* history of the world was ever of so great importance as that on which the Song of Solomon appeared in Israel. For all other scriptures are holy, but the Song of Solomon the holiest of all. If there was any dispute, it was respecting Ecclesiastes. R. Johanan, son of Joshua, the son of R. Akiba's father-in-law, said: As ben Asai has declared, so was it disputed and so decided. *Edujoth* v. 3: R. Simon (according to R. Ismael) says: In three cases the school of Shammai decided in a manner to lighten, the school of Hillel to aggravate difficulties. According to the school of Shammai, Ecclesiastes does not defile the hands; the school of Hillel says. It defiles the hands, etc. Hieronymus, *Comment. in Ecclesiast.* xii. 19 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, iii. 496): "Aiunt Hebraei quum inter caetera scripta Salomonis quae antiquata sunt nec in memoria duraverunt et hic liber obliterandus videretur eo quod vanas Dei assereret creaturas et totum putaret esse pro nihilo et cibum et potum et delicias transeuntes praeferret omnibus, ex hoc uno capitulo meruisse auctoritatem, ut in divinorum voluminum numero poneretur." See in general, Bleek, *Theol. Stud. und Kritik.* 1853, p. 321 sq. Delitzsch, *Zeitsch. für luth. Theol.* 1854, pp. 280-288. Strack, art. "Kanon des A. T.'s," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 2nd ed. vii. 429 sq. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen paläst. Theologie*, p. 81.

¹⁰ S. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 101 sq. Against the canonical authority of the Book of Wisdom, see Strack in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* vii. 430 sq. It is quite a mistake to think we have a right to infer with Movers (*Loci quidam historiae canonis Vet. Test. illustrati*, 1842, p. 14sq.), and after him with Bleek (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 323), from those passages in Josephus (*Antt.* Preface, § 3, x. 10. 6, xxii. 11. 2; *contra Apion.* i. 1. 10) in which he states generally that the Holy Scriptures (*τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα, αἱ ἱερὰ βιβλῆ*) were his authorities for his whole history, that he also regarded such of his authorities as did not belong to the Hebrew canon as "holy Scriptures." For these were chiefly heathen authorities. Geiger too can scarcely be right when he insists on regarding as among such "holy scriptures," which according to *Shabbath* xvi. 1 might not be read on the Sabbath day, the apocryphal books (*Zeitschr.* 1867, pp. 98-102). For by these are probably meant, as Jewish expositors also declare, the Kethubim (of these only the five Megilloth were used in the public worship of the synagogues, and these only on special occasions during the year). See Kisch, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1880, p. 543 sqq.

bim with the Thorah, they were never placed quite on a level with it. The Thorah always occupied a higher position as to its religious estimation. In it was deposited and fully contained the original revelation of the Divine will. In the *prophets* and the other sacred writings this will of God was *only further delivered*. Hence these are designated as the "tradition" (קבלה, Aramaean אשלמתא), and cited as such.¹¹ On account of its higher value it was decided that a book of the law might be purchased by the sale of the Holy Scriptures, but not Holy Scriptures by the sale of a book of the law.¹² In general, however, the *Nebiim* and *Kethubim* participate in the properties of the Thorah. They are all "Holy Scriptures" (כתבי הקודש);¹³ with respect to them all it is determined, that contact with them defiles the hands (so that they may not be touched inconsiderately, but with reverent awe).¹⁴ They are all cited by essentially the same formulas. For although special formulas are sometimes used for the Thorah, yet the formula, which most frequently occurs, שנאמר, "for it is said," is applied without distinction to the Thorah and the other Scriptures;¹⁵ as also in the sphere of Hellenism (comp. the N. T.), the formula γέγραπται and the like.¹⁶ Nay

¹¹ In the Mishna, *Taanith* ii. 1, a passage from Joel is cited with the formula: "in the tradition he says" (בקבלה הוא אומר). Comp. in general, Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 44. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 18 sq. Joh. Delitzsch, *De inspiratione scripturae sacrae*, p. 7 sq. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* (Cambridge 1877), p. 120 sq.

¹² *Megilla* iii. 1.

¹³ *Shabbath* xvi. 1; *Erubin* x. 3; *Baba bathra* i. 6, *fin.*; *Sanhedrin* x. 6; *Para* x. 3; *Jadajim* iii. 2, 5, iv. 5, 6.

¹⁴ *Edujoth* v. 3; *Kelim* xv. 6; *Jadajim* iii. 2, 4, 5, iv. 5, 6.

¹⁵ So e.g. to adduce citations from the *Kethubim* only: *Berachoth* vii. 8 (Ps. lxxviii. 27), *Berachoth* ix. 5 (Ruth ii. 4), *Pea* viii. 9 (Prov. xi. 27), *Shabbath* ix. 2 (Prov. xxx. 19), *Shabbath* ix. 4 (Ps. cix. 18), *Rosh hashana* i. 2 (Ps. xxxiii. 15). In these the quotation is always introduced by the formula שנאמר. But this very formula is also by far the most frequent in quotations from the *Nebiim* and the Thorah. Comp. the list of scriptural quotations in Pinner, *Uebersetzung des Tractates Berachoth* (1842), *Introd.* fol. 21b.

¹⁶ See in general on the formulas of citation, Surenhusius, βίβλος καταληγής (Amstelodami 1713), pp. 1–36. Döpke, *Hermeneutik der neutestament-*

the Nebiim and Kethubim are sometimes quoted as "the law" (*νόμος*).¹⁷ And there is perhaps nothing more characteristic of the full appreciation of their value on the part of the Jews, than the fact that *they too are not first of all to Jewish conviction* didactic or consolatory works, not books of edification or history, but also "law," the substance of God's claims upon His people.

II. THE SCRIBES AND THEIR LABOURS IN GENERAL.

THE LITERATURE.

Ursinus, *Antiquitates Hebraicae scholastico-academicae*. Hafniae 1702 (also in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxi.).

Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen* (1831), pp. 384-413.

Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i. (1838) pp. 109-214.

Winer, *RWB.* ii. 425-428 (art. "Schriftgelehrte").

Jost, *Das geschichtliche Verhältniss der Rabbinen zu ihren Gemeinden* (*Zeitschr. für die historische theologie* (1850), pp. 351-377).

Levysohn, *Einiges über die hebräischen und aramäischen Benennungen für Schule, Schüler und Lehrer* (Franke's *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* (1858), pp. 384-389).

Leyrer, art. "Schriftgelehrt," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. xiii. (1860) pp. 731-741.

Klöpper, art. "Schriftgelehrte," in Schenkel's *Bibelllexicon*, vol. v. pp. 247-255.

Ginsburg, art. "Scribes," in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*.

Plumptre, art. "Scribes," in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*.

Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie* (1880), pp. 121-143.

Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii., arts. "Gelehrter," "Lehrhaus," "Rabban," "Schüler," "Sopherim," "Talmudlehrer," "Talmudschulen," "Unterhalt," "Unterricht."

Strack, art. "Schriftgelehrte," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 2nd ed. xiii. (1884) pp. 696-698.

lichen Schriftsteller (1829), pp. 60-69. Pinner, *Uebersetzung des Tractates Berachoth*, Introd. fol. 21a, 22a. Joh. Delitzsch, *De inspiratione scripturae sacrae*, p. 4sq. Comp. also Strack, *Prolegomena critica in Vet. Test.* (1873), p. 60 sqq.

¹⁷ Rom. iii. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 21; John x. 34, xii. 34, xv. 25.

With the existence of a law is naturally involved the necessity of its *scientific study, and of a professional acquaintance with it*. Such necessity exists at least in proportion as this law is comprehensive and complicated. An acquaintance with its details, a certainty in the application of its several enactments to everyday life, can then only be attained by its being made a matter of professional occupation. In the time of Ezra, and indeed long after, this was chiefly the *concern of the priests*. Ezra himself was at the same time both priest and scribe (סופר). The most important element of the Pentateuch was written in the interest of the priestly cultus. Hence the priests were at first the teachers and guardians of the law. Gradually however this was changed. The higher the law rose in the estimation of the people, the more did its study and exposition become an independent business. It was the law of God, and every individual of the nation had the same interest as the priests in knowing and obeying it. Hence *non-priestly Israelites* more and more occupied themselves with its scientific study. An independent class of "biblical scholars or scribes," *i.e.* of men who made acquaintance with the law a profession, was formed beside the priests. And when in the time of Hellenism the priests, at least those of the higher strata, often applied themselves to heathen culture, and more or less neglected the law of their fathers, the scribes ever appeared in a relative contrast to the priests. It was no longer the priests, but the scribes, who were the zealous guardians of the law. Hence they were also from that time onwards the *real teachers of the people*, over whose spiritual life they bore complete sway.

In the time of the New Testament we find this process fully completed; the scribes then formed a firmly compacted class in undisputed possession of a spiritual supremacy over the people. They are usually called in the New Testament *γραμματεῖς*, *i.e.* "learned in Scripture," "the learned," corresponding to the Hebrew סופרים, which in itself means nothing more than *homines literati* (men professionally occupied with

the Scriptures).¹⁸ That such occupation should concern itself chiefly with the law was self-evident. Besides this general designation, we also meet with the more special one *νομικοί*, i.e. "the learned in the law," "jurists" (Matt. xxii. 35; Luke vii. 30, x. 25, xi. 45 sq., 52, xiv. 3);¹⁹ and inasmuch as they not only knew, but taught the law, they were likewise called *νομοδιδάσκαλοι*, "teachers of the law" (Luke v. 17; Acts v. 34). Josephus calls them *πατρίων ἐξηγηταὶ νόμων*,²⁰ or in Graecized fashion *σοφισταί*,²¹ also *ιερογραμματεῖς*.²² In the Mishna the expression סופרים is only used of the scribes of former times, who in the times of the Mishna had already become an authority.²³ Contemporary scribes are

¹⁸ סופר is any one professionally employed about books, e.g. also a writer (*Shabbath* xii. 5; *Nedarim* ix. 2; *Gittin* iii. 1, vii. 2, viii. 8, ix. 8; *Baba mezia* v. 11; *Sanhedrin* iv. 3, v. 5) or a bookbinder (*Pesachim* iii. 1). On its use in the Old Testament, see Gesenius' *Thesaurus*, p. 966. When it is said in the Talmud, that the scribes were called סופרים because they counted the letters of the Thorah (*Kiddushin* 30a, in Wunsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien*, 1878, p. 13. 179), this is of course only a worthless etymological trifling.

¹⁹ *νομικός* is in later Greek the proper technical expression for a "jurist," *juris peritus*. Thus especially of Roman jurists in Strabo, p. 539: οἱ παρὰ Παρμαίοις νομικοί, also in the *Edictum Diocletiani*, see Rudorff, *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, ii. 54. It is not accidentally that the expression is so frequently found in St. Luke. He purposes thereby to make clear to his Roman readers the character of the Jewish scribes.

²⁰ *Antt.* xvii. 6, 2. *Comp.* xviii. 3. 5.

²¹ *Bell. Jud.* i. 33. 2, ii. 17. 8, 9.

²² *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 3.

²³ See *Orla* iii. 9; *Jebamoth* ii. 4, ix. 3 (*Sota* ix. 15); *Sanhedrin* xi. 3; *Kelim* xiii. 7; *Para* xi. 4-6; *Tohoroth* iv. 7, 11; *Tebul jom* iv. 6; *Jedajim* iii. 2. In all these passages, with the exception of that in *Sota* ix. 15, which does not belong to the original text of the Mishna, "the ordinances of the scribes (רברי סופרים)" are spoken of as distinct from the prescriptions of the Thorah, and in such wise that the former also are regarded as having been for a long period authoritative. Apart from these passages the expression סופרים only occurs in the Mishna in the sense stated above, note 18. On the other hand, in *Shemoneh Esreh*, in the 13th *Beracha*, God is entreated to let His mercy dispose of "the righteous, the pious, and the elders of Israel and the rest of the scribes" (פליטת סופרים), which latter are consequently assumed to be still existing. The Greek *γραμματεῖς* is still found in Jewish epitaphs in Rome of the date of the later emperors (2nd to 4th century after Christ); see Garrucci, *Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei scoperto recentemente in Vigna Randanini* (1862), pp. 42, 46, 47, 54, 55, 59, 61.

always called רַבֵּי in the Mishna. The extraordinary respect paid to these "scholars" on the part of the people was expressed by the titles of honour bestowed upon them. The most usual was the appellation רַבִּי, "my master;" Greek, *πάββι* (Matt. iii. 7 and elsewhere).²⁴ From this respectful address the title Rabbi was gradually formed, the suffix losing its pronominal signification with the frequent use of the address, and רַבִּי being also used as a title (Rabbi Joshua, Rabbi Eliezer, Rabbi Akiba).²⁵ This use cannot be proved before the time of Christ. Hillel and Shammai were never called Rabbis, nor is *πάββι* found in the New Testament except as an actual address. The word does not seem to have been used as a title till after the time of Christ. רַבִּי, or as the word is also pronounced רַבָּן, is an enhanced form of רַב. The first form seems to belong more to the Hebrew, the second to the Aramaean usage.²⁶ Hence רַבָּן is found in the

Garrucci, *Dissertazioni arcænologiche*, vol. ii. (1865), p. 165, no. 20, 21, p. 182, no. 21.

²⁴ רַב means simply "master," in opposition, e.g., to slave (*Sukka* ii. 9; *Gittin* iv. 4, 5; *Edujoth* i. 13; *Aboth* i. 3). The mode of address רַבִּי, "my master," is found in the Mishna, e.g. *Pesachim* vi. 2; *Rosh hashana* ii. 9, *fin.*; *Nedarim* ix. 5; *Baba kamma* viii. 6. Also with the plural suffix רַבֵּינוּ, "our master," *Berachoth* ii. 5, 7. This predicate having been bestowed upon the scribes in their teaching capacity, רַב gradually acquired the meaning of "teacher." It seems to have been already thus used in a saying attributed to Joshua ben Perachiah, *Aboth* i. 6. In the time of the Mishna this meaning was, at all events, quite common; see *Rosh hashana* ii. 9, *fin.*; *Baba mezia* ii. 11; *Edujoth* i. 3, viii. 7; *Aboth* iv. 12; *Kerithoth* vi. 9, *fin.*; *Jadajim* iv. 3, *fin.* Comp. John i. 89.

²⁵ Like *Monsieur*. Comp. on the title of Rabbi generally, Seruppii *Dissert. de titulo Rabbi* (in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxi.). Lightfoot and Wetzstein on Matt. xxiii. 7. Buxtorf, *De abbreviaturis hebraicis*, pp. 172-177. Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, p. 137 sqq. Winer, *RWB.* ii. 296 sq. Pressel in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. xii. 471 sq. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 431 Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, v. 305. Steiner in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* v. 29 sq. Riehm's *Wörterb. s.v.* Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, Div. ii. art. "Rabban." The Lexica to the New Testament, s.v. *πάββι*.

²⁶ Both forms appear in the Targums (see Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. s.v.* Levy, *Chald. Wörterb. s.v.*), and on the other hand רַבָּן almost always in the Hebrew. Of the form רַבָּן only one example is known to me in the Mishna, viz. in *Taanith* iii. 8, where it is used with reference to God. On

Mishna as the title of four prominent scribes of the period of the Mishna (about A.D. 40–150),²⁷ and in the New Testament, on the other hand, *ῥαββουνί* (רַבִּון or רַבֵּן) as a respectful address to Christ (Mark x. 51; John xx. 16).²⁸ In the Greek of the New Testament Rabbi is represented by *κύριε* (Matt. viii. 2, 6, 8, 21, 25 and frequently) or *διδάσκαλε* (Matt. viii. 9 and frequently); in St. Luke also by *ἐπιστάτα* (Luke v. 5, viii. 24, 45, ix. 33, 49, xvii. 13). *Πατήρ* and *καθηγητής* (Matt. xxiii. 9, 10) are also mentioned as other names of honour given to scribes. The latter is probably equal to מוֹרֶה, “teacher.”²⁹ The former answers to the Aramaic אֲבָא, which also occurs in the Mishna and Tosefta as the title of several Rabbis.³⁰

the meaning of רבן *Aruch* says (s.v. אָבִי, see the passage, e.g. in Buxtorf, *De abbreviaturis*, p. 176): גּוֹל מֶרֶב רַבִּי וְגוֹל מֶרֶב רַבָּן, “greater than Rab is Rabbi, and greater than Rabbi is Rabban.”

²⁷ These four are—(1) Rabban Gamaliel I., (2) Rabban Johanan ben Sakkai, (3) Rabban Gamaliel II., (4) Rabban Simon ben Gamaliel II. To all these the title רבן is as a rule ascribed in the best MSS. of the Mishna (e.g. *Cod. de Rossi* 138). Rabban Gamaliel III., son of R. Judah ha-Nasi, also occurs once in the Mishna (*Aboth* ii. 2). Of two others, to whom this title is usually applied (Simon the son of Hillel, and Simon the son of Gamaliel I.), the former does not occur in the Mishna at all, the latter, at least in the chief passage, *Aboth* i. 17, not under this title. He is however probably intended by Rabban Simon ben Gamaliel, mentioned *Kerithoth* i. 7.

²⁸ The opinion formerly expressed by Delitzsch, that the form רבן is only used with reference to God (*Zeitschr. f. luth. Theol.* 1876, pp. 409, 606), has been since withdrawn by himself as erroneous from consideration of the usual diction of the Targum (*Zeitschr. f. luth. Theol.* 1878, p. 7). That the form רבן is pronounced *ribbon* by modern Jews, as also רבי, *ribbi*, is quite irrelevant. The shortening of ך into ם is confessedly very frequent in Hebrew, but in this case of very recent date. In the Middle Ages it was probably still pronounced רַבֵּן, as the *Cod. de Rossi* 138 prints the passage *Taanith* iii. 8. Comp. also Delitzsch, *Zeitschr. f. luth. Theol.* 1876, p. 606. It is only for the Aramaean that the pronunciation *ribbon* is well evidenced. See Berliner's *Ausgabe des Onkelos*, e.g. Gen. xix. 2, xlii. 30; Ex. xxi. 4–8, xxiii. 17.

²⁹ See Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien* (1878), p. 279 sq.

³⁰ Abba Saul is the most frequently mentioned among these, *Pea* viii. 5; *Kilajim* ii. 3; *Shabbath* xxiii. 3; *Shekalim* iv. 2; *Beza* iii. 8; *Aboth* ii. 8; *Middoth* ii. 5, v. 4 and elsewhere. Comp. also Abba Gurjan (*Kiddushin* iv. 14); Abba Joses ben Chanan (*Middoth* ii. 6. Tosefta, ed. Zuckermannel,

The Rabbis required from their pupils the most absolute reverence, surpassing even the honour felt for parents. "Let thine esteem for thy friend border upon thy respect for thy teacher, and respect for thy teacher on reverence for God."⁸¹ "Respect for a teacher should exceed respect for a father, for both father and son owe respect to a teacher."⁸² "If a man's father and teacher have lost anything, the teacher's loss has the precedence (*i.e.* he must first be assisted in recovering it). For his father only brought him into this world. His teacher, who taught him wisdom, brings him into the life of the world to come. But if his father is himself a teacher, then his father's loss has precedence. If a man's father and his teacher are carrying burdens, he must first help his teacher and afterwards his father. If his father and his teacher are in captivity, he must first ransom his teacher and afterwards his father. But if his father be himself a scholar, the father has precedence."⁸³ The Rabbis in general everywhere claimed the first rank. "They loved the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues and greetings in the markets, and to be called of men Rabbi, Rabbi" (Matt. xxiii. 6, 7; Mark xii. 38, 39; Luke xi. 43, xx. 46).

All the labours of the scribes, whether educational or judicial, were to be *gratuitous*. R. Zadok said: Make the knowledge of the law neither a crown wherewith to make a show, nor a spade wherewith to dig. Hillel used to say: He who uses the crown (of the law) for external aims fades away.⁸⁴ That the judge might not receive presents was already prescribed in the Old Testament (Ex. xxiii. 8; Deut. xvi. 9). Hence it is also said in the Mishna: "If any one

pp. 154. 18, 199. 22, 233. 22, 655. 31); Abba Joses ben Dosai (*Tosefta* 23. 4, 217. 19, 360. 16, etc.); Abba Judan (*Tosefta* 259. 18, 616. 31). Others in Zuckermandel's *Index to the Tosefta*, p. xxxi.

⁸¹ *Aboth* iv. 12.

⁸² *Kerithoth* vi. 9, *fn.*

⁸³ *Baba mezia* ii. 11. Comp. also Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i. 144 sq. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen paläst. Theologie*, p. 121 sq.

⁸⁴ *Aboth* iv. 5, i. 13. Comp. also Gfrörer, *Das Jahrh. des Heils*, i. 156-160.

receives payment for a judicial decision, his sentence is not valid.”⁸⁵ The Rabbis were therefore left to other sources for obtaining a livelihood. Some were persons of property, others practised some trade as well as the study of the law. The combination of some secular business with the study of the law is especially recommended by Rabban Gamaliel III., son of R. Judah ha-Nasi. “For exertion in both keeps from sin. The study of the law without employment in business must at last be interrupted, and brings transgression after it.”⁸⁶ It is known that St. Paul, even when a preacher of the gospel, practised a trade (Acts xviii. 3; 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8). And we are told the like of many Rabbis.⁸⁷ In such a case their occupation with the law was of course esteemed the more important, and they were cautioned against over-estimation of their secular business. The son of Sirach already warns against a one-sided devotion to handicraft, and extols the blessing of scriptural wisdom (Wisd. xxxviii. 24–39, 11). R. Meir said: Give yourselves less to trade and occupy yourselves more with the law;⁸⁸ and Hillel: He who devotes himself too much to trade will not grow wise.⁸⁹

The principle of non-remuneration was strictly carried out only in their *judicial* labours, but hardly in their employment as *teachers*. Even in the Gospel, notwithstanding the express admonition to the disciples, *δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε* (Matt. x. 8), it is also said that a labourer is worthy of his hire (Matt. x. 10; Luke x. 7), to which saying St. Paul expressly refers (1 Cor. ix. 15) when he claims as his right—although he but exceptionally used it—a maintenance from those to whom he preached the gospel (1 Cor. ix. 3–18; 2 Cor. xi.

⁸⁵ *Bechoroth* iv. 6.

⁸⁶ *Aboth* ii. 2.

⁸⁷ Comp. Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen*, p. 410 sq. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrh. des Heils*, i. 160–163. Delitzsch, *Handwerkerleben zur Zeit Jesu* (2nd ed. 1875), pp. 71–83; *Lehrstand und Handwerk in Verbindung*. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, Div. ii. p. 288 (art. “Gelehrter”) and p. 1241 (art. “Unterhalt”). Seligmann Meyer, *Arbeit und Handwerk im Talmud* (1878), pp. 23–36.

⁸⁸ *Aboth* iv. 10.

⁸⁹ *Aboth* ii. 5.

8, 9; Phil. iv. 10-18. Comp. also Gal. vi. 6). If such was the view of the times, it may be supposed that the Jewish teachers of the law also did not always impart their instruction gratuitously, nay the very exhortations quoted above, not to practise instruction in the law for the sake of selfish interest, lead us to infer that absence of remuneration was not the general rule. In Christ's censures of the scribes and Pharisees their covetousness is a special object of reproof (Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47, xvi. 14). Hence, even if their instruction was given gratuitously, they certainly knew how to compensate themselves in some other way. The moral testimony borne to them by Christ was by no means of the best: "All their works they do to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries and enlarge the borders of their garments (Matt. xxiii. 5), and love to go in long garments" (Mark xii. 38; Luke xx. 46).

The headquarters of the operations of the scribes was of course Judaea until A.D. 70. But we should be mistaken if we expected to find them there only. Wherever zeal for the law of the fathers was active they were indispensable. Hence we meet with them in Galilee also (Luke v. 17), nay in the distant Dispersion; for *γραμματεῖς* are frequently mentioned in Jewish epitaphs in Rome of the later imperial period (see above, note 23), and the Babylonian scribes of the fifth and sixth centuries were the authors of the Talmud, the chief work of Rabbinic Judaism.

After the separation of the *Pharisaic* and *Sadduceean* tendencies the scribes in general adhered to the former. For this was nothing else but the party, that acknowledged as an authoritative rule of life the maxims, which had in the course of time been developed by the scribes, and sought to carry them strictly out. Inasmuch however as the "scribes" were merely "men learned in the law," there must have been also Sadduceean scribes. For it is not conceivable that the Sadducees, who acknowledged the written law as binding, should have had among them none who made it their pro-

fession to study it. In fact those passages of the New Testament, which speak of scribes who were of the Pharisees (Mark ii. 16 ; Luke v. 30 ; Acts xxiii. 9), point also to the existence of Sadducean scribes.

The professional employment of the scribes referred, if not exclusively, yet first and chiefly, to *the law*, and therefore to *the administration of justice*. They were in the first instance *Jurists*, and their task was in this respect a threefold one: (1) *the more careful theoretical development of the law itself*; (2) *the teaching of it to their pupils*; (3) *its practical administration*, that is, the *pronunciation of legal decisions* as learned assessors in courts of justice.⁴⁰

1. *First the theoretic development of the law itself*. This indeed was immovably fixed as to its principles in the Torah itself. But no codex of law goes into such detail as to be in no need of exposition, while some of the appointments of the Mosaic law are expressed in very general terms. Here then was a wide field for the labours of the scribes. They had always to develop with careful casuistry the general precepts given in the Torah, that so a guarantee might exist, that the tendency of the precepts of the law had been really apprehended according to their full extent and meaning. In those points for which the written law made no direct provision a compensation had to be created, either by the establishment of a precedent, or by inference from other already valid legal decisions. By the diligence with which this occupation was carried on during the last centuries before the Christian era, Jewish law became gradually an extensive and complicated science; and this law not being fixed in writing, but propagated by oral tradition, very assiduous study was required to obtain even a general acquaintance with it. An acquaintance however with what was binding was but the foundation and prerequisite for the professional labours of the scribes. Their special province was to develop what was already

⁴⁰ This threefold "power of the wise" is also correctly distinguished by Weber (*System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*, pp. 130-143).

binding by continuous methodical labours into more and more subtle casuistic details. For all casuistry is by its very nature endless.⁴¹

The object of all these labours being to settle a system of law binding on all, the work could not be performed in an isolated manner by individual scribes. It was necessary that constant mutual communication should be going on among them for the purpose of arriving, upon the ground of a common understanding, at some generally acknowledged results. *Hence the whole process of systematizing the law was carried on in the form of oral discussions of the scribes among each other.* The acknowledged authorities not merely gathered about them pupils, whom they instructed in the law, but also debated legal questions among themselves, nay discussed the entire matter of the law in common disputations. Of this method of giving structure to the law, the Mishna everywhere testifies.^{41a} To make this possible, it was needful that the heads at least of the body of scribes should dwell together at certain central localities. Many indeed would be scattered about the country for the purposes of giving instruction and pronouncing judicial decisions. But the majority of those authorities, who were mainly of creative genius, must have been concentrated at some one central point—till A.D. 70 at Jerusalem, and afterwards at other places (Jabne, Tiberias).

The law thus theoretically developed by scholars was certainly, in the first place, only a theory. In many points it also remained such, the actual historical and political circumstances not allowing of its being carried into practice.^{41b} In general however the labours of the scribes stood in an active relation to actual life; and in proportion as their

⁴¹ See further details in No. 3: Halachah and Haggadah.

^{41a} Compare e.g. *Pea* vi. 6; *Kilajim* iii. 7, vi. 4; *Terumoth* v. 4; *Maaser sheni* ii. 2; *Shabbath* viii. 7; *Pesachim* vi. 2, 5; *Kerithoth* iii. 10; *Machshirin* vi. 8; *Jadajim* iv. 3.

^{41b} For an instructive example of the kind, see *Jadajim* iv. 3–4. Comp. also the purely theoretical definitions as to the composition of the tribes, *Sanhedrin* i. 5; *Horajoth* i. 5.

credit increased, did *their theory become valid law*. In the last century before the destruction of Jerusalem the Pharisaic scribes bore already such absolute spiritual sway, that the great Sanhedrim, notwithstanding its mixed composition of Pharisees and Sadducees, adhered in practice to the law developed by the Pharisees (see above, p. 179). Many matters were besides of such a nature as not to need any formal legislation. For the godly would observe religious institutions, not on account of formal legislation, but by reason of a voluntary subjection to an authority which they acknowledged as legitimate.⁴² Hence the maxims developed by the scribes were recognised as binding in practice also, so soon as the schools were agreed about them. The *scribes* were in fact, though not upon the ground of formal appointment, *legislators*. This applies in a very special manner to the time *after the destruction of the temple*. There then no longer existed a *civil* court of justice like the former Sanhedrim. The Rabbinical scribes, with their purely spiritual authority, were now the only influential factors for laying down a rule. They had formerly been the *actual* establishers of law, they now were more and more acknowledged as deciding authorities. *Their judgment sufficed to determine what was valid law*. As soon then as doubt arose concerning any point, or it was questioned whether this or that course of action should be embraced, it was customary to bring the matter "before the learned," who then pronounced an authoritative decision.⁴³ And so great was the authority of these teachers of the law, that the judgment of even one respected teacher sufficed to decide a question.⁴⁴ New dogmas, *i.e.* new rules legally valid,

⁴² The priests too almost always followed the theory of the scribes. They are but exceptional cases in which the Mishna has to report a difference between the practice of the priests and the theory of the Rabbis; see *Shekalim* i. 3-4; *Joma* vi. 3; *Sebachim* xii. 4.

⁴³ "The matter came before the learned (חכמים) and they decided thus and thus," is a formula of frequent occurrence. See *e.g.* *Kilajim* iv. 9; *Edujoth* vii. 3; *Bechoroth* v. 3.

⁴⁴ In this manner are doubtful cases decided, *e.g.*, by Rabban Johanan

sometimes even differing from what had hitherto been customary, were laid down, without even such special occasion.⁴⁴ In such cases however it was always assumed that the decision of the individual agreed with the decision of the majority of all the teachers of the law, and was accepted by them (see No. 3). Hence it might happen that the decision of a single teacher would be subsequently corrected by the majority,⁴⁵ or that even an eminent teacher would be obliged to subordinate his own view to those of a "court" of teachers.⁴⁷

The legislative power of the Rabbis was a thing so self-evident in the time of the Mishna, that it is often without further ceremony assumed also for the time before the destruction of Jerusalem. It is said quite naturally that Hillel decreed this or that,⁴⁸ or that Gamaliel I. enacted this or that.⁴⁹ And yet not Hillel or Gamaliel I., but the great Sanhedrim of Jerusalem, was then the ultimate resort for decision. For thence proceeded, as is said in the Mishna itself, "the law for all Israel."⁵⁰ The truth in this representation is, that in any case the great teachers of the law were already the deciding authorities.

2. The second chief task of the scribes was to *teach the law*. The ideal of legal Judaism was properly, that every Israelite should have a professional acquaintance with the law. If this were unattainable, then the greatest possible number was

ben Sakkai (*Shabbath* xvi. 7, xxii. 3), Rabban Gamaliel II. (*Kelim* v. 4), R. Akiba (*Kilajim* vii. 5; *Terumoth* iv. 13; *Jebamoth* xii. 5; *Nidda* viii. 3).

⁴⁵ So e.g. by Rabban Johanan ben Sakkai (*Sukka* iii. 12; *Rosh hashana* iv. 1, 3, 4; *Sota* ix. 9; *Menachoth* x. 5) and by R. Akiba (*Maaser sheni* v. 8; *Nasir* vi. 1; *Sanhedrin* iii. 4).

⁴⁶ Thus was a decision of Nahum the Median subsequently corrected by "the learned," *Nasir* v. 4.

⁴⁷ E.g. R. Joshua had to agree to a decision of Rabban Gamaliel II. and his court, *Rosh hashana* ii. 9.

⁴⁸ *Shebiith* x. 3; *Gittin* iv. 3; *Arachin* ix. 4. Everywhere with the formula הִתְקַן, "he decreed."

⁴⁹ *Rosh hashana* ii. 5; *Gittin* iv. 2-3. Equally with the formula הִתְקַן.

⁵⁰ *Sanhedrin* xi. 2.

to be raised to this ideal elevation. "Bring up many scholars" is said to have been already a motto of the men of the Great Synagogue.⁵¹ Hence the more famous Rabbis often assembled about them in great numbers, youths desirous of instruction,⁵² for the purpose of making them thoroughly acquainted with the much ramified and copious "oral law." The pupils were called תַּלְמִידִים, or more fully תַּלְמִידֵי הַחֲכָמִים.⁵³ The instruction consisted of an indefatigable continuous exercise of the memory. For the object being that the pupils should remember with accuracy the entire matter with its thousands upon thousands of minutiae, and the oral law being never committed to writing, the instruction could not be confined to a single statement. The teacher was obliged to repeat his matter again and again with his pupils. Hence in Rabbinic diction "to repeat" (שָׁנָה = δευτεροῦν) means exactly the same as "to teach" (whence also מִשְׁנָה = teaching).⁵⁴ This repetition was not however performed by the teacher only delivering his matter. The whole proceeding was, on the contrary, disputational. The teacher brought before his pupils several legal questions for their decision and let them answer them or answered them himself. The pupils were also allowed to propose questions to the teacher.⁵⁵ This form of catechetical lecture has left its mark upon the style of the Mishna, the question being frequently started how this or that subject is to be under-

⁵¹ *Aboth* i. 1.

⁵² *Joseph. Bell. Jud.* xxxiii. 2.

⁵³ *Pesachim* iv. 5; *Joma* i. 6; *Sukka* ii. 1; *Chagiga* i. 8; *Nedarim* x. 4; *Sota* i. 3; *Sanhedrin* iv. 4, xi. 2; *Makkoth* ii. 5; *Aboth* v. 12; *Horajoth* iii. 8; *Negaim* xii. 5. Pupils e.g. of Rabban Johanan ben Sakkai (*Aboth* ii. 8), of Rabban Gamaliel II. (*Berachoth* ii. 5-7), of R. Ismael (*Erubin* ii. 6), R. Akiba (*Nidda* viii. 3), pupils of the school of Shammai (*Orla* ii. 5, 12), are severally mentioned. The appellation חֲכָם for one who has finished his study of the law, but has not yet obtained any publicly acknowledged position, belongs to the later Middle Ages. In the Mishna the word has quite another meaning. See § 26.

⁵⁴ Comp. Hieronymus, *Epist.* 121 *ad Algasiam*, quaest. x. (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, i. 884 sq.): Doctores eorum σοφοί hoc est sapientes vocantur. Et si quando certis diebus traditiones suas exponunt discipulis suis, solent dicere: οἱ σοφοὶ δευτεροῦσιν, id est sapientes docent traditiones.

⁵⁵ See Lightfoot and Wetzstein on *Luke* ii. 46.

stood for the purpose of giving a decision.⁵⁶ All knowledge of the law being strictly traditional, a pupil had only two duties. One was to keep everything faithfully in memory. R. Dosthai said in the name of R. Meir: He who forgets a tenet of his instruction in the law, to him the Scripture imputes the wilful forfeiture of his life.⁵⁷ The second duty was never to teach anything otherwise than it had been delivered to him. Even in expression he was to confine himself to the words of his teacher: "Every one is bound to teach with the expressions of his teacher," *הַיֵּב אֶדָרִם לְדוֹמַר בְּלָשׁוֹן*.⁵⁸ It was the highest praise of a pupil to be "like a well lined with lime, which loses not one drop."⁵⁹

For these theoretical studies of the law, whether the disputations of the scribes with each other or instruction properly so called, there were in the period of the Mishna, and probably also so early as the times of the New Test., special localities, the so-called "houses of teaching" (Heb. *בֵּית הַמִּדְרָשׁ*, plur. *בֵּתֵי מִדְרָשׁוֹת*).⁶⁰ They are often mentioned in conjunction with the synagogues as places, which in legal respects enjoyed certain privileges.⁶¹ In Jabne a locality which was called "the vineyard" (*כְּפָרִים*) is mentioned as a place of meeting of the learned, from which however we cannot infer, that *כְּפָרִים* was in general a poetic term for a

⁵⁶ E.g. *Berachoth* i. 1-2; *Pea* iv. 10, vi. 8, vii. 3, 4, viii. 1; *Kilajim* ii. 2, iv. 1, 2, 3, vi. 1, 5; *Shebiith* i. 1, 2, 5, ii. 1, iii. 1, 2, iv. 4. The question is very frequently introduced by *כִּי־כֵן* (=how?): *Berachoth* vi. 1, vii. 3; *Demai* v. 1; *Terumoth* iv. 9; *Maaser sheni* iv. 4, v. 4; *Challa* ii. 8; *Orla* ii. 2, iii. 8; *Bikkurim* iii. 1, 2; *Erubin* v. 1, viii. 1.

⁵⁷ *Aboth* iii. 8.

⁵⁸ *Edujoth* i. 3.

⁵⁹ *Aboth* ii. 8. Comp. also Gfrörer, *Das Jahrh. des Heils*, i. 168-173.

⁶⁰ *Berachoth* iv. 2; *Demai* ii. 3, vii. 5; **Terumoth* xi. 10; *Shabbath* xvi. 1, xviii. 1; **Pesachim* iv. 4; *Beza* iii. 5; *Aboth* v. 14; *Menachoth* x. 9; *Jadajim* iv. 3, 4. In the passages marked * the plural form occurs. On other designations of the house of teaching, see Vitranga, *De synagoga vetere*, p. 133 sqq.

⁶¹ *Terumoth* xi. 10; *Pesachim* iv. 4. It is evident from both passages, that the houses of teaching were distinct from the synagogues. On the high estimation in which these houses of teaching were held, see also Hamburger, *Real-Encycl.* ii. 675-677, art. "Lehrhaus."

house of teaching.⁶² In Jerusalem indeed the catechetical lectures were held "in the temple" (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, Luke ii. 46; Matt. xxi. 23, xxvi. 55; Mark xiv. 49; Luke xx. 37; John xviii. 20), *i.e.* in the colonnades or some other space of the outer court. The pupils sat on the ground during the instruction (שָׂרְפָה) of the teacher, who was on an elevated place (hence Acts xxii. 3: παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλιήλ; comp. also Luke ii. 46).⁶³

3. A third duty, which equally belonged to the calling of the scribes, was *passing sentence* in the court of justice. Their acquaintance with the law being a professional one, their votes could not but be of influential importance. It is true that at least during the period under consideration, a special and scholarly acquaintance with the law was by no means essential to the office of a judge. Any one might be a judge, who was appointed such through the confidence of his fellow-citizens. And it may be supposed, that the small local courts were for the most part lay courts. It was nevertheless in the nature of things, that confidence should be placed in a judge in proportion as he was distinguished for a thorough and accurate knowledge of the

⁶² *Kethuboth* iv. 6; *Edujoth* ii. 4. According to the connection of the two passages, כּרם was a place where the learned were accustomed to assemble in Jabne (R. Eleasar and R. Ismael delivered this and that *before the learned in the vineyard at Jabne*). It is probable that an actual vineyard with a house or court, which served as a place of meeting, is intended. The traditional explanation tries indeed to deduce the appellation from the circumstance, that in the house of teaching the תלמידים sat in rows like vine plants (so already *Jer. Berachoth* iv. fol. 7^d in Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* ii. 408, and after this the commentators of the Mishna, see Surenhusius' edition iii. 70, iv. 332). See, on the contrary, Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, p. 380, note 3.

⁶³ According to later Talmudic tradition, the sitting on the ground on the part of scholars was not customary till after the death of Gamaliel I.; in earlier times they used to stand (*Megilla* 21a, in Lightfoot, *Horae hebraicae on Luke* ii. 46). The whole tradition however is merely an explanation of *Sota* ix. 15: "Since Rabban Gamaliel the elder died, reverence for the law has disappeared." See, on the other hand, beside Luke ii. 46, *Aboth* i. 4, according to which Joses ben Joeser already said, one ought to let oneself be covered with dust at the feet of the wise.

law. So far then as men learned in the law were to be found, it is self-evident that such would be called to the office of judge. With respect to the great Sanhedrim at Jerusalem, it is expressly testified in the New Testament, that *γραμματεῖς* also were among those who were its members (comp. above, p. 177 sq.). After the fall of the Jewish State, A.D. 70, the authority of the Rabbis increased in independent importance in this respect also. Being now recognised as independent *legislators*, they were also regarded as independent *judges*. Their sentences were voluntarily acquiesced in, whether they gave judgment collectively or individually. Thus it is *e.g.* related, that R. Akiba once condemned a man to 400 sus (denarii) as compensation for uncovering his head to a woman in the street.⁶⁴

This threefold activity of the scribes as men learned in the law formed their chief and special calling. But the Holy Scriptures are something besides law. Even in the Penta-teuch *narrative* occupies a wide space, while the contents of other books are almost exclusively either *historical* or *didactic*. This fact always remained, customary as it was to look upon the whole chiefly from the view-point of law. These Scriptures then being also deeply studied, it was impossible not to let history be spoken of as history and religious edification as such. What however was common in the treatment of these Scriptures and those of the law was, that they too were dealt with as *a sacred text*, *a sacred standard*, which was not only to be deeply studied, but which had also to be subjected to a complete *elaboration*. As the law was more and more developed, so also was the sacred history and the religious instruction further developed, and that always in connection with the text of Scripture, which just in its quality of a sacred text silently invited to such deep investigation. In such development the notions of subsequent times had, of course, a very important influence in modifying results. History and dogma were not merely further

⁶⁴ *Baba kamma* viii. 8.

developed, but fashioned according to the views of after times. This gave rise to what is usually called the Haggadah.⁶⁵ It is true that it did not belong to the special province of teachers of the law to occupy themselves therewith. But since the manipulation of the law and that of the historical religious and ethical contents of the sacred text arose from a kindred exigency, it was a natural result, that both should be effected by the same persons. As a rule the learned occupied themselves with both, though some distinguished themselves more in the former and others more in the latter department.

In their double quality of men learned in the law and learned in the "Haggadah," the scribes were also qualified above others for *delivering lectures and exhortations in the synagogues*. These were not indeed confined to appointed persons. Any one capable of so doing might stand up to teach in the synagogue at the invitation of the ruler (see § 27). But as in courts of justice the learned doctors of the law were preferred to the laity, so too in the synagogue their natural superiority asserted itself.

To the juristic and haggadic elaboration of Holy Scripture, was added a third kind of occupation therewith, viz. *the care of the text of Scripture as such*. The higher the authority of the sacred text, the more urgent was the necessity for its conscientious and unadulterated preservation. From this necessity originated all those observations and critical notes subsequently comprised under the name of the Massora (the computation of verses, words and letters, orthographical notes, critical remarks on the text, and such like). This work however was mainly the labour of a later period. During that with which we are occupied its first beginnings had at most been made.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ For further particulars, see No. 3.

⁶⁶ Comp. on the Massora, Strack in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, 2nd ed. ix. 388-394. Reuss, *Gesch. der heiligen Schriften A. T.'s*, § 581, and the literature cited by both; also Hamburger, *Real-Encycl.* ii. 1211-1220 (art. "Text der Bibel"). Only isolated remarks, which perhaps belong to the subject, are found in the Mishna, *Pesachim* ix. 2 (that a point stands over the ך in חקק, Num. ix. 10); *Sota* v. 5 (that the ם in Job xiii. 15 may mean

III. HALACHAH AND HAGGADAH.

THE LITERATURE.

- Surenhusius, Βίβλος καταλλαγῆς in quo secundum veterum theologorum Hebraeorum formulas allegandi et modos interpretandi conciliantur loca ex V. in N. T. allegata (Amstelodami 1713), especially pp. 57–88.
- Wachner, *Antiquitates Ebraeorum*, vol. i. 1743, p. 353 sqq.
- Döpke, *Hermeneutik der neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller*, part i. 1829.
- Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen* (1831), pp. 384–731.
- Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, historisch entwickelt*, Berlin 1832.
- Hirschfeld, *Der Geist der talmudischen Auslegung der Bibel*. Erster Thl. *Halachische, Exegese* 1840. The same, *Der Geist der ersten Schriftauslegungen oder die hagadische Exegese*, 1847.
- Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig 1841), pp. 163–203, especially pp. 179–191. The same, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik*, Leipzig 1851 (354, p. 8). The same, *Ueber palästinische und alexandrinischen Schriftforschung*, Breslau 1854 (42, p. 4).
- Welte, *Geist und Werth der altrabbinischen Schriftauslegung* (Tüb. Theol. Quartalschrift, 1842, pp. 19–58).
- Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Neuen Testaments*, § 502–505 (über die Auslegung des A. T. bei den Juden).
- Diestel, *Gesch. des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche* (1869), pp. 6–14.
- Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 137 ff., 226–263.
- Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner, Secten* i. 90 ff., 227–288.
- Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der inneren Entwicklung des Judenthums*, Leipzig 1857.
- Pressel, “Rabbinismus,” in Herzog’s *Real-Encycl.*, 1st ed. vol. xii. (1860), pp. 470–487.
- Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgeschichte*, 2nd ed. i. 80–113.
- Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien* (1875), pp. 66–77 (on the influence of Hellenism upon the Palestinian Midrash, see also Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschr.* xi. 1875, p. 227 sqq.).
- Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria* (1875), p. 142 sqq. (on the mutual influence of the Palestinian and Alexandrian theology and exegesis).
- Bacher, *Die Agada der babylonischen Amoräer*, 1878.
- Bacher, *Die Agada der Tannaiten* (Grätz’ *Monatsschrift für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1882–1884). Also separately under the title,

“him” or “not”). When R. Akiba says, *Aboth* iii. 13, that the מִסְפָּת is “a fence about the Thorah,” מִסְפָּת means not the critico-textual, but the Halachic tradition; see Strack, p. 388.

- Die Agada der Tannaiten*, vol. i. From Hillel to Akiba, Strasbourg 1884.
- Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästin. Theologie* (1880), especially pp. 88–121.
- Reuss, *Gesch. der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), § 411–415, 582–584.
- Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. (1883) art. “Agada” (pp. 19–27), “Allegorie” (pp. 50–53), “Exegese” (pp. 181–212), “Geheimlehre” (pp. 257–278), “Halacha” (pp. 338–353), “Kabbala” (pp. 557–603), “Mystik” (pp. 816–819), “Rabbinismus” (pp. 944–956), “Recht” (pp. 969–980).

1. *The Halachah.*

The *theoretical* labours of the scribes were, as has been already remarked in the preceding section, of a twofold kind, —1. the development and establishment of the law, and 2. the manipulation of the historical and didactic portions of the Holy Scriptures. The former developed a *law of custom* beside the written Torah, called in Rabbinical language the Halachah (הֲלָכָה), properly that which is current and customary). The latter produced an abundant variety of historical and didactic notions, usually comprised under the name of the Haggadah or Agadah (הַגָּדָה or אֲגָדָה, properly narrative, legend). The origin, nature and contents of both have now to be more fully discussed.

Their common foundation is the investigation or exposition of the Biblical text, Hebr. דְּרִישׁ.⁶⁷ By investigation however

⁶⁷ דְּרִישׁ is found in the Mishna in the following constructions:—1. To investigate, to explain a passage or portion of Scripture, the accusative object being either expressed or to be mentally supplied. *Berachoth* i. 5; *Pesachim* x. 4, *fin.*; *Shekalim* i. 4, v. 1; *Joma* i. 6; *Megilla* ii. 2; *Sota* v. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, ix. 15; *Sanhedrin* xi. 2. 2. with ב in the same sense “to give explanations of a passage,” *Chagiga* ii. 1. 3. “To find or discover a doctrine by investigation,” e.g. אֵת זֶה דְּרִישׁ מִן, “he discovered this from such and such a passage” (*Joma* viii. 9), or without מִן (*Jebamoth* x. 3; *Chullin* v. 5), or in the combination זֶה מְדִישׁ דְּרִישׁ, “Such or such a one gave this explanation” (*Shekalim* vi. 6; *Kethuboth* iv. 6). The substantive formed from דְּרִישׁ is מְדִישׁ, investigation, explanation, elaboration (*Shekalim* vi. 6; *Kethuboth* iv. 6; *Nedarim* iv. 3; *Aboth* i. 17); also in the combination בֵּית הַמְדִישׁ, see above, note 60. It is already found 2 Chron. xiii. 22, 24, 26.

was not meant historical exegesis in the modern sense, but the search after new information upon the foundation of the existing text. The inquiry was not merely what the text in question according to the tenor of its words might say, but also what knowledge might be obtained from it by logical inference, by combination with other passages, by allegorical exegesis and the like. The kind and method of investigation was different in the treatment of the law and in that of the historical and dogmatico-ethic portions, and comparatively stricter in the former than in the latter.

The *Halachic Midrash* (i.e. the exegetic development of passages of the law) had first of all to regard only the extent and range of the several commands. It had to ask: to what cases in actual life the precept in question applied, what consequences it in general entailed, and what was to be done, that it might be strictly and accurately observed according to its full extent. Hence the commandments were split and split again into the subtlest casuistic details, and care was taken by the most comprehensive precautionary measures, that no kind of accidental circumstance should occur in observing them, which might be regarded as an infringement of their absolutely accurate fulfilment. The legal task was not, however, exhausted by this analysis of the existing text. There were also many *difficulties* to solve, some arising from internal contradictions in the legal code itself, some from the incongruity of certain legal requirements with the actual circumstances of life; others, and these the most numerous, from the incompleteness of the written law. To all such questions scholars had to seek for an answer; it was their business to obviate existing discrepancies by establishing an authoritative explanation; to point out how, when the observance of a precept was either impossible, difficult, or inconvenient, by reason of the actual relations of life, a compromise might nevertheless be made with the letter of its requirements; and lastly, to find for all those cases of actual occurrence, which were not directly regulated by the written law, some legal

direction when the need for such should arise. This last department especially furnished an inexhaustible source of labour for juristic discussion. Again and again did questions arise concerning which the written or hitherto appointed law gave no direct answer, and to reply to which became therefore a matter of juristic discussion. For answering such questions two means were actually at their disposal, viz. inference from already recognised dogmas and the establishment of an already existing tradition. The latter, so far as it could be determined, was of itself decisive.

Scientific exegesis (Midrash) was thus by no means the only source for the formation of a legal code. A considerable portion of what subsequently became valid law had on the whole no point of connection with the Thorah, but was at first only *manner and custom*. This or that had been done thus or thus, and so imperceptibly custom grew into a *law of custom*. When anything in the legal sphere had been so long usual that it could be said, it has always been thus, it was law by custom. It was then by no means necessary that its deduction from the Thorah should be proved; ancient tradition was as such already binding. And the recognised teachers of the law were enjoined and competent to confirm this law of custom.

From these two sources there grew up in the course of time a multitude of legal decisions by the side of, and of equal authority with, the written Thorah. These were all comprised under the common notion of the *Halachah*, i.e. the *law of custom*. For what was discovered by scientific investigation was, when it obtained validity, also law by custom, הִלְכָּה.⁶⁸ Hence valid

⁶⁸ This comprehensive notion of the הִלְכָּה appears from the following passages: *Pea* ii. 6, iv. 1, 2; *Orla* iii. 9; *Shabbath* i. 4; *Chagiga* i. 8; *Jebamoth* viii. 3; *Nedarim* iv. 3; *Edujoth* i. 5, viii. 7; *Aboth* iii. 11, 18, v. 8; *Kerithoth* iii. 9; *Jadajim* iv. 3, *fin*. "Jewish custom," דִּת יְהוּדִית (*Kethuboth* vii. 6), is synonymous with דִּרְךְ אֶרֶץ (*Kiddushin* i. 10), and as only designating the conventional, must not be confounded with the *Halachah*.

law now included two main categories, the written Torah and the Halachah,⁶⁹ which, till at least towards the close of the period with which we are occupied, was propagated only orally. *Within the Halachah* there are again *different categories*: (1) single Halachoth (traditional enactments) decidedly traced back to Moses;⁷⁰ (2) the great body or Halachah proper; (3) certain enactments which are designated as the "*appointments of the scribes*" (דְּבָרֵי סוֹפְרִים).⁷¹ All three categories are of legal obligation. But their authority nevertheless differs in degree according to the above sequence, those of the first class being highest, and those of the third relatively lowest. For while the Halachah in general was regarded as having been at all times valid, there was with regard to the דְּבָרֵי סוֹפְרִים the conviction, that they were first introduced by the successors of Ezra, viz. by the סוֹפְרִים.⁷² There was in general, in the period of the Mishna, a perfect consciousness that many traditional ordinances had no kind of foundation in the Torah, and that others were connected with it by the slightest of ties.⁷³ Nevertheless the law of custom was quite as binding

⁶⁹ תּוֹרָה or מִקְרָא (writing) and הֶלְכָּה are distinguished, e.g. in *Orla* iii. 9; *Chagiga* i. 8; *Nedarim* iv. 3. So too are מִקְרָא and מִשְׁנָה (the teaching of the law), *Kiddushin* i. 10.

⁷⁰ Such הלכות למשה מסיני are mentioned in the Mishna in three passages: *Pea* ii. 6; *Edujoth* viii. 7; *Jadajim* iv. 3, *fin.* There are altogether from fifty to sixty in the Rabbinical-Talmudic literature.

⁷¹ *Orla* iii. 9; *Jebamoth* ii. 4, ix. 3; *Sanhedrin* xi. 3; *Para* xi. 4-6; *Tohoroth* iv. 7; *Jadajim* iii. 2. Comp. also *Kelim* xiii. 7; *Tebul jom* iv. 6.

⁷² That the דְּבָרֵי סוֹפְרִים had relatively less authority than the Halachah simply, is evident from *Orla* iii. 9 (where it is quite unjustifiable to supplement הֶלְכָּה by לְמֹשֶׁה מִסִּינִי). On the recent date of the דְּבָרֵי סוֹפְרִים, comp. especially *Kelim* xiii. 7; *Tebul jom* iv. 6: דְּבָרֵי חֹרֵשׁ הָדָשׁ סוֹפְרִים.

⁷³ Compare especially the remarkable passage, *Chagiga* i. 8: "Release from a vow is a dogma which hovers, as it were, in the air, for there is nothing in Scripture on which it can be founded. The laws concerning the Sabbath, the festival sacrifices, and the defrauding (of sacred things by misuse), are like mountains hanging by a hair, for there are few passages of Scripture and many laws of custom (הֶלְכֹת) concerning them. On the other hand, the civil laws (דִּינִין), the laws of ritual, the laws concerning uncleanness and incest, are entirely founded on Scripture, and form the essential contents of the (written) Torah."

as the written Torah; ⁷⁴ nay, it was even decided that opposition to the דברי סופרים was a heavier transgression than opposition to the decrees of the Torah; ⁷⁵ because the former, being the authentic exposition and completion of the latter, were therefore in fact the ultimate authority.

It was in the nature of the Halachah that it never could be a thing *finished and concluded*. The two sources, whence it arose, were continually flowing onwards. New enactments were always being evolved by successive scientific exegesis (Midrash), and new customs might always arise as usage differed. Both, when they had attained prescriptive right, became Halachah, the extent of which might thus be enlarged *ad infinitum*. But at each stage of development *a distinction was always made between what was already valid and what was only discovered by the scientific inferences of the Rabbis*, between הלכה and דין (to judge). Only the former was legally binding, the latter in and of itself not as yet so. ⁷⁶ Not till the majority of the learned had decided in their favour were such tenets binding and henceforth admitted into the Halachah. For the majority of those distinguished for learning was the *decisive tribunal*. ⁷⁷ Hence the דברי חכמים were also to be kept as binding. ⁷⁸ It is self-evident however, that this principle applies only to such cases as were not decided by an already valid Halachah. For concerning any matter for which a Halachah is in existence this must be unconditionally obeyed, though ninety-nine should be against and only one for it. ⁷⁹ By the help of this principle of the majority the great difficulty which arose through the separation of the schools of Hillel and Shammai was overcome (see No. 4). So long as the differences between the two were not reconciled, the conscientious Israelite must

⁷⁴ Comp. especially, *Aboth* iii. 11, v. 8.

⁷⁵ *Sanhedrin* xi. 3: חומר בדברי סופרים מִדְּבָרֵי תוֹרָה.

⁷⁶ See especially, *Jebamoth* viii. 3; *Kerithoth* iii. 9. The הלכות and מדרש are therefore distinguished from each other as two kinds of subjects of instruction. *Nedarim* iv. 3.

⁷⁷ *Shabbath* i. 4 sqq.; *Edujoth* i. 4-6, v. 7; *Mickwaoth* iv. 1; *Jadajum* iv. 1, 3.

⁷⁸ *Negaim* ix. 3, xi. 7.

⁷⁹ *Pea* iv. 1-2.

have been in great perplexity which to adhere to. The majority here too gave the final decision, whether it was that the schools themselves compared numbers, and that one was outvoted by the other,⁸⁰ or that subsequent scholars settled differences by their final decision.⁸¹

The strictness with which the unchangeableness of the Halachah was in general proclaimed might induce one to suppose, that what was once valid must remain unaltered. But there is no rule without exception, nor was this so. Nor indeed are the cases few in which laws or customs were afterwards *altered*, whether on purely theoretical grounds, or on account of altered circumstances, or because the old custom entailed inconvenience.⁸²

Widely as the Halachah differed from the written Torah the fiction was still kept up, that it was in reality nothing else than an exposition and more precise statement of the Torah itself. *The Torah was still formally esteemed as the supreme rule from which all legal axioms must be derived.*⁸³ Certainly the Halacha had its independent authority, and was binding, even if no scriptural proof was adduced. Hence, though its validity did not depend upon success in finding a scriptural proof, it formed part of the business of the scribes to confirm the maxim of the Halachah by the Scriptures.⁸⁴ More

⁸⁰ A few cases are mentioned in which the school of Hillel was outvoted by the school of Shammai, *Shabbath* i. 4 sqq.; *Mikwaoth* iv. 1.

⁸¹ As a rule the Mishna, after mentioning the differences of the two schools, states the decision of "scholars."

⁸² Such innovations were *e.g.* introduced by Hillel (*Shebiith* x. 3; *Gittin* iv. 3; *Arachin* ix. 4), Rabban Gamaliel (*Rosh hashana* ii. 5; *Gittin* iv. 2-3), Rabban Johanan ben Sakkai (*Sukka* iii. 12; *Rosh hashana* iv. 1, 3, 4; *Sota* ix. 9; *Menachoth* x. 5), R. Akiba (*Maaser sheni* v. 8; *Nasir* vi. 1; *Challa* iv. 7; *Bikkurim* iii. 7; *Shekalim* vii. 5; *Joma* ii. 2; *Kethuboth* v. 3; *Nedarim* xi. 12; *Gittin* v. 6; *Edujoth* vii. 2; *Tebul jom* iv. 5).

⁸³ This holds good notwithstanding the admission mentioned in note 73. See especially, Weber, p. 96 sqq.

⁸⁴ That this supplementary learned confirmation of the Halachah often referred to passages of Scripture entirely different to those from which the Halachic maxims really arose, is seen, *e.g.* in the classic passage *Shabbath* ix. 1-4.

absolute was the demand for satisfactory confirmation in the case of newly advanced or disputed maxims. These could only obtain recognition by methodical Midrash, *i.e.* by being deduced in a convincing manner from passages of Scripture, or from other already acknowledged propositions. The *method of demonstration* which was in such cases applied, was one which, though it indeed appears somewhat strange to us, has its rules and laws. A distinction was made between the proof proper (רְאִיָּה) and the mere reference (זִכָּר).⁸⁵ Hillel is said to have laid down for the proof proper *seven rules*, which may be called a kind of Rabbinical logic.⁸⁶ These seven rules are as follows: (1) קַל וְחִמְרָא, "light and heavy," *i.e.* the inference *a minori ad majus*; ⁸⁷ (2) הִנָּה נִשְׁוֶה, "an equal decision," *i.e.* an inference from the similar, *ex analogia*; ⁸⁸ (3) בִּנְיָן אֶב מִכְּחַב אֶחָד, "a main proposition from *one* passage of Scripture," *i.e.* a deduction of a main enactment of the law from a single passage of Scripture; (4) בִּנְיָן אֶב מִשְׁנֵי כְּתוּבִים, "a main proposition from two passages of Scripture;" (5) בָּלָל וּפְרָט, "general and particular," and "particular and general," *i.e.* a more precise statement of the general by the particular, and of the particular by the general; ⁸⁹ (6) כִּיּוּצָא בּוּ

⁸⁵ *Shabbath* viii. 7, ix. 4; *Sanhedrin* viii. 2. Comp. Weber, p. 115 sqq.

⁸⁶ They are found in the Tosefta, *Sanhedrin* vii. *fin.* (ed. Zuckermann, p. 427), in the *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan* c. 37, and at the close of the introduction to the *Sifra* (Ugolini, *Thesaurus*, vol. xiv. 595). The text of the *Sifra* is, at least according to the edition of Ugolini, defective. The correct reading is found from the almost verbally identical texts of the two other authorities. Comp. Hillel and his seven rules of interpretation in the *Monatschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1851–52, pp. 156–162.

⁸⁷ Examples in *Berachoth* ix. 5; *Shebiith* vii. 2; *Beza* v. 2; *Jebamoth* viii. 3; *Nasir* vii. 4; *Sota* vi. 3; *Baba bathra* ix. 7; *Sanhedrin* vi. 5; *Edujoth* vi. 2; *Aboth* i. 5; *Sebachim* xii. 3; *Chullin* ii. 7, xii. 3; *Bechoroth* i. 1; *Kerithoth* iii. 7, 8, 9, 10; *Negaim* xii. 5; *Machshirin* vi. 8.

⁸⁸ *E.g.* *Beza* i. 6: "Challah and gifts are presents due to the priests, and so is the Terumah. As then the latter may not be brought to the priest on a holy day, so neither may the former." Another example in *Arachin* iv. *fin.* In both passages the expression הִנָּה נִשְׁוֶה is used.

⁸⁹ In the thirteen Middoth of R. Ismael this figure is specified in eight different manners, *e.g.* by the formula כָּלל וּפְרָט וְכָלל—"general and particular and general"—*i.e.* a more precise statement of two general expres-

בְּמָקוֹם אֲחֵר, "by the similar in another passage," i.e. a more precise statement of a passage by the help of another; (7) דְּבָר הַלָּמֵד מֵעֲנִינוֹ, "a thing which is learned from its connection," a more precise statement from the context. These seven rules were subsequently increased to thirteen, the fifth being specified in eight different manners, and the sixth omitted. The laying down of these thirteen Middoth is ascribed to R. Ismael. Their value for the correct interpretation of the law was so highly esteemed on the part of Rabbinic Judaism, that every orthodox Israelite recited them daily as an integral element of his morning devotions.⁹⁰

The *matter* which formed the subject of juristic investigation on the part of the scribes was in effect furnished by the Torah itself. The precepts concerning the priestly sacrifices and religious usages in general occupy the largest space therein. For the peculiarity of the Jewish law is, that it is pre-eminently a *law of ritual*. It seeks in the first place to establish by law in what manner God desires to be honoured, what sacrifices are to be offered to Him, what festivals are to be kept in His honour, how His priests are to be maintained, and what religious rites in general are to be observed. All other matters occupy but a small space in comparison with this. The motive whence all the zealous labours of the scribes arose corresponded with this content of the law: it was the desire to make sure by an accurate expression of the law, that none of the claims of God should be violated in even the slightest particular, but that all should be most conscientiously observed to their fullest extent. The endeavours of sions by a particular one intervening, as e.g. Deut. xiv. 26, where the general expression, "whatever thy soul desireth," used at the beginning and end, is limited by the words "oxen, sheep, wine, intoxicating drink, which stand between.

⁹⁰ Hence they are found in every Jewish Siddur (Book of Prayers), as well as in the introduction to the *Sifra*. Comp. Waechner, *Antiquitates Ebraeorum*, i. 422–523. Pinner's translation of the treatise, *Berachoth*, Introd. fol. 17b–20a. Pressel in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, ed. 1, xv. 651 sq. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen paläst. Theol.* pp. 106–115.

the scribes were therefore directed chiefly to the development of (1) the precepts concerning sacrifices, the various kinds of sacrifice, the occasions on which it was to be offered, the manner of offering, and all connected therewith, *i.e.* of the entire sacrificial ritual; (2) the precepts concerning the celebration of holy seasons, especially of the Sabbath and the annual festivals—Passover, Pentecost, Tabernacles, the Day of Atonement, the New Year; (3) the precepts concerning tribute for the temple and priesthood—first-fruits, heave-offerings, tithes, the first-born, the half-shekel tribute, vows and freewill offerings and whatever related to them—their redemption, valuation, embezzlement, etc.; and lastly (4) the various other religious appointments, among which *the precepts concerning clean and unclean* occupy by far the largest space. The appointments of the law in this last respect were an inexhaustible source for the exercise of the most minute and conscientious acuteness on the part of the scribes. The statutes by which it was determined, under what circumstances uncleanness was incurred, and by what means it might be obviated, were truly endless and incalculable. Such religious decrees however by no means formed the exclusive matter of the labours of the scribes. For the law of Moses contains also the principles of a criminal and civil law; and the practical requirements of life offered occasion enough for the further development of these materials also. Of course the materials in question were not all equally elaborated. The laws concerning marriage were the most completely developed, partly because the marriage law gave more opportunity, and partly because this subject was the most closely connected with religion. The other departments of civil life are not treated with quite the same fulness in the Mishna (in the treatises *Baba kamma*, *Baba mezia*, and *Baba bathra*), and still less is the criminal law worked out (in the treatises *Sanhedrin* and *Makkoth*). The department of public law is as good as completely ignored. It is true that the Thorah furnished but extremely little opportunity for its development.

and that such labour as was expended on it would have been utterly useless by reason of political circumstances.⁹¹

2. *The Haggada.*

The *Haggadic Midrash*, i.e. the elaboration of the historical and didactic portions of Holy Scripture, is of an entirely different kind from the Halachic Midrash. While in the latter the treatment is pre-eminently a development and carrying on of what is actually given in the text, the Haggadic treatment does not take for the most part its content from the text, but interpolates it therein. It is an amplification and remodelling of what was originally given, according to the views and necessities of later times. It is true, that here also the given text forms the point of departure, and that a similar treatment to that employed in passages from the law takes place in the first instance. The history is worked up by combining the different statements in the text with each other, completing one by another, settling the chronology, etc. Or the religious and ethical parts are manipulated by formulating dogmatic propositions from isolated prophetic utterances, by bringing these into relation to each other, and thus obtaining a kind of dogmatic system. But this stricter kind of treatment is overgrown by the much freer kind, which deals in a perfectly unrestrained manner with the text, and supplements it by additions of the most arbitrary and manifold kind. In other words, the treatment is Midrash in its stricter sense in only the smaller portion, and is on the contrary and for the most part a free completion by means of *אגדות*, i.e. legends.^{91a}

⁹¹ The survey of the contents of the Mishna (see § 3) furnishes proof of what is stated above.

^{91a} Just as the *Halachah* was developed from *Midrash* in the province of law, was the Haggadah developed from Midrash in the other books of Scripture, only the relation was in the latter case a much looser one. The *אגדות* are mentioned as an independent subject of instruction beside *מדרש* and *הלכות* in *Nedarim* iv. 3.

A canonical book of the Old Testament, viz. the Book of Chronicles, furnishes a very instructive example of the *historical Midrash*. A comparison of its narrative with the parallel portions of the older historical books (Kings and Samuel) will strike even the cursory observer with the fact that the chronicler has enlarged the history of the Jewish kings by a whole class of narratives, of which the older documents have as good as nothing, viz. by *narratives of the merit acquired*, not only by David, but by many other pious kings *through their maintenance of, and more abundant provision for, the priestly ritual*. The chronicler is especially solicitous to tell of the conscientious care of these kings for the institutions of public worship. In the older documents scarcely anything is found of these narratives which run through the whole of Chronicles. It may be said that their absence in the books of Kings and Samuel is no proof of their non-historical nature, and that the chronicler obtained them from other sources. But the peculiarity is, that the very institutions for the maintenance of which these kings are said to have been distinguished, belong in general to the post-exilian period, as may, at least in the main points, be still proved (see § 24). Evidently then the chronicler dealt with the older history from a stated point of sight, which appeared to him very essential; and as public worship was the most important matter in his own eyes, the theocratic kings could not but have been distinguished by their interest in it. At the same time he pursues the practical object of pointing out the just claims and high value of these institutions by showing the attention, which the most illustrious kings devoted to them. The notion that this was any adulteration of the history, was probably one which never occurred to him. He thought he was improving it by treating it according to the needs of his age. His work, or rather the larger work from which our Books of Chronicles are probably but an extract, is therefore, properly speaking, an *historical Midrash*, as indeed it is expressly designated

(מדרש) by its editor and abbreviator (2 Chron. xiii. 22, xxiv. 27).⁹²

The method of dealing with the sacred history here described continued its exuberant growth to later ages and went on striking out ever bolder paths. The higher the credit and importance of the sacred history rose in the ideas of the people, the more thorough was the labour bestowed upon it, and the more urgent was the impulse to give more accuracy, more copious elaboration of details, and to surround the whole with a more complete and brighter halo. Especially were the histories of the patriarchs and the great lawgiver more and more adorned in this fashion. The *Hellenistic* Jews were particularly active in this manner of working up history. Nay, one might almost have supposed that it had originated with them, but that the Books of Chronicles furnish proof to the contrary, and that the whole method of this Midrash so entirely corresponds with the spirit of Rabbinical scholarship. The *literature*, in which the remains of this Haggadic treatment of history are still preserved is comparatively copious and varied. We find such in the works of the Hellenists Demetrius, Eupolemus, Artapanus (see concerning them, § 33); in Philo and Josephus,⁹³ in the so-called Apocalypses, and generally in the pseudepigraphic literature;⁹⁴ much also in the Targums and Talmud, but most in the Midrashim proper, which are *ex professo* devoted to the treatment of the sacred text (see above, § 3). Among these the oldest is the so-called Book of Jubilees, which may rank as the specially classic model of this Haggadic treatment of Scripture. The whole text of the canonical Book of Genesis is here reproduced in such wise,

⁹² Comp. Wellhausen, *Geschichte Israels*, i. 236 sq.

⁹³ On Josephus, see Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 120. On Philo's contact with the Palestinian Midrash, see Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria*, pp. 142-159.

⁹⁴ Comp. especially, Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti* (2 vols. 1713-1723), whose work is so arranged that the literary remains relating to each Scripture character are placed together, according to their chronological order.

that not only are the particulars of the history chronologically fixed, but also enlarged throughout in contents, and remodelled according to the taste of after times. By way of illustrating this branch of labour on the part of the scribes, the following few specimens are given.⁹⁵

*The history of the creation, e.g., is completed in the following manner: "Ten things were created in the twilight on the evening before the Sabbath—1. the abyss of the earth (for Korah and his company); 2. the opening of the well (Miriam's); 3. the mouth of the ass (Balaam's); 4. the rainbow; 5. the manna in the wilderness; 6. the rod of Moses; 7. the shamir, a worm which spits stones; 8. alphabetic writing; 9. the writing of the tables of the law; 10. the stone tables. Some reckon with these: the evil spirits, the grave of Moses, and our father Abraham's ram; and others the first tongs for the preparation of future tongs."*⁹⁶ A copious circle of legends, with which we are acquainted by means of their deposits and continuations in later Jewish literature, was formed concerning the life of Adam.⁹⁷ Enoch, who was miraculously translated to heaven by God, seemed especially adapted for revealing heavenly mysteries to men. Hence a book of such revelations was ascribed to him towards the end of the second century before Christ (see § 32). Later legends praise his piety and describe his ascension to heaven.⁹⁸ The Hellenist Eupolemus (or whoever else may be the author of the fragment in question) designates him as the inventor of astrology.⁹⁹ It is self-evident that Abraham, the ancestor of Israel, was a subject of special interest for this kind of

⁹⁵ Compare in general, Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung*, etc., pp. 464–514. Herzfeld, *Gesch. d. Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 490–502. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, i. 286 sqq.

⁹⁶ *Aboth* v. 6.

⁹⁷ Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr.* i. 1–24, ii. 1–13. Hort, art. "Adam, books of," in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. i. (1877), pp. 34–39. Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. xii. 366 sq.

⁹⁸ Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. art. "Henochsage."

⁹⁹ Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 17.

historical treatment. Hellenists and Palestinians took equal pains with it. A Hellenistic Jew, probably as early as the third century before Christ, wrote, under the name of Hecataeus of Abdera, a book concerning Abraham.¹⁰⁰ According to Artabanus, Abraham instructed Pharethothes, king of Egypt, in astrology.¹⁰¹ He was in the eyes of Rabbinic Judaism a model of Pharisaic piety and a fulfiller of the whole law, even before it was given.¹⁰² He victoriously withstood—it is computed—ten temptations.¹⁰³ In consequence of his righteous behaviour, he received the reward of all the ten preceding generations, which they had lost by their sin.¹⁰⁴ *Moses* the great lawgiver and his age are surrounded with the brightest halo. The Hellenists, in works designed for heathen readers, represent him as the father of all science and culture. He was, according to Eupolemus, the inventor of alphabetical writing, which first came from him to the Phoenicians, and from them to the Greeks. Artabanus tells us that the Egyptians owed to him their whole civilisation.¹⁰⁵ It is therefore something less, when it is only said in the Acts, that he was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians (Acts vii. 22), though even this goes beyond the Old Testament. The history of his life and work is dressed up in the most varied manner in Hellenistic and Rabbinic legends, as may be seen even from the representations of Philo and Josephus.¹⁰⁶ The names of the Egyptian sorcerers, who were conquered by

¹⁰⁰ Joseph. *Antt.* i. 7. 2. Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 113.

¹⁰¹ Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 18. Comp. also on Abraham as an astrologer, Joseph. *Antt.* i. 7. 1. Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr.* i. 350–378.

¹⁰² *Kiddushin* iv. 14, *fin.* Comp. *Nedarim* iii. 11, *s. fin.*

¹⁰³ *Aboth* v. 3. Book of Jubilees in Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 15; *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan*, c. 33; *Pirke de-Rabbi Elieser*, c. 26–31; *Targum Jer.* on Gen. xxii. 1. Fabricius, i. 398–400. Beer, *Leben Abrahams*, pp. 190–192. The interpreter of *Aboth* v. 3 (Surenhusius' *Mishna*, iv. 465. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, p. 94).

¹⁰⁴ *Aboth* v. 2. Comp. generally, Beer, *Leben Abraham's nach Auffassung der jüdischen Sage*, Leipzig 1859.

¹⁰⁵ Eupolemus, *Euseb. Praep. evang.* ix. 26 = Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 23. 153. Artabanus, *Euseb. Praep. evang.* ix. 27.

¹⁰⁶ Philo, *Vita Mosis*. Joseph. *Antt.* ii.–iv. Compare generally, Fabri-

Moses and Aaron, are known (2 Tim. iii. 8). In the march through the wilderness, the Israelites were not merely once miraculously provided with water from a rock, but a rock pouring forth water accompanied them during their whole wandering in the wilderness (1 Cor. x. 4). The law was not given to Moses by God Himself, but reached him by the means of angels (Acts vii. 53; Gal. iii. 19; Heb. ii. 2). It was part of the perfection of his revelation to have been written in seventy languages on stones set up upon Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii. 2 sqq.).¹⁰⁷ The two unlucky days in the history of Israel being Tammus 17 and Ab 9, the unfortunate events of the Mosaic age must of course have taken place on one of these two days; on Tammus 17 the tables of the law were broken, and on Ab 9 it was ordained that the generation of Moses should not enter the land of Canaan.¹⁰⁸ The strange circumstances at the death of Moses also furnished abundant material for the formation of legends (Deut. xxxiv.).¹⁰⁹ It is known that Michael the Archangel contended with Satan for his body (Jude 9). The history too of the post-Mosaic period was manipulated by historical Midrash in the same manner as the primitive history of Israel. To give only a few examples from the New Testament. In 1 Chronicles and Ruth there occurs in the list of David's ancestors a certain Salma or Salmon, the father of Boaz (1 Chron. ii. 11; Ruth iv. 20 sq.). The historical Midrash knows, that this Salmon had Rahab for his wife (Matt. i. 5).¹¹⁰ The drought and famine in the days of Elijah lasted, according to the historic Midrash, three and a

cus, *Codex pseudepigr.* i. 825-868, ii. 111-180. Beer, *Leben Moses nach Auffassung der jüdischen Sage*, Leipzig 1868.

¹⁰⁷ *Sota* vii. 5, with reference to Deut. xxvii. 8, בְּאֵר הַיִּטָּב, "plainly engraven (therefore intelligibly to all)." The seventy languages correspond with the seventy nations of Gen. x.; see Targum Jonathan on Gen. xi. 7-8; Deut. xxxii. 8; *Pirke de-Rabbi Elieser*, c. 24, in Wagenseil on *Sota* vii. 5, in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, iii. 263.

¹⁰⁸ *Taanith* iv. 6, also the passages of the Gemara in Lundius, in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. 382.

¹⁰⁹ Comp. already Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 8. 48.

¹¹⁰ According to another Midrash, Rahab was the wife of Joshua.

half years, *i.e.* half of a week of years (Luke iv. 25 ; Jas. v. 17).¹¹¹ The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews mentions among the martyrs of the Old Testament those who were sawn asunder (Heb. xi. 37). He means Isaiah, of whom the Jewish legend says that this was the manner of his death.¹¹²

As in the case of the sacred history, so also in that of the religious and ethical matter of the Scriptures, the manipulation was of two kinds. On the one hand there was a dealing by combination, by inference and the like, with what was actually given ; on the other there was also a free completion by the varied formations of creative religious speculation. And the two imperceptibly encroached one upon the other. Not a few of the doctrinal notions and ideas of after times actually arose from the circumstance, that the existing text of Scripture had been made a subject of "investigation," and therefore from reflection upon data, from learned inferences and combinations founded thereupon. Imagination freely employing itself was however a far more fertile source of new formations. And what was obtained in the one way was constantly blended with what was arrived at in the other. With the results of investigation were combined the voluntary images of fancy, nay the former as a rule always followed, either consciously or unconsciously, the same lines, the same tendency and direction as the latter. And when the free creations of speculation had gained a settled form, they

¹¹¹ So too *Talkut Shimoni* in Surenhusius, Βίβλος καταλλαγῆς, p. 681 sq. On the Elijah legends in general, comp. S. K., *Der Prophet Elia in der Legende* (*Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1863, pp. 241-255, 281-296). Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. i.

¹¹² *Ascensio Isajae* (ed. Dillmann, 1877), c. v. 1 ; *Jebamoth* 49^b. Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 120. Tertullian, *de patientia*, c. 14 ; *scorpiace*, c. 8. Hippolyt. *de Christo et Antichristo*, c. 30. Origenes, *epist. ad African.* c. 9 ; *comment. ad Matt.* xiii. 57 and xxiii. 37 (*Opp.* ed. Lommatszsch, iii. 49, iv. 238 sq.) ; *Commodian. carmen apologet.* v. 509 sq. (ed. Ludwig) ; Hieronymus, *comment. ad Isaiam*, c. 57, *fin.* (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, iv. 666). Other patristic passages in Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr.* i. 1088 sq. Wetzstein and Bleek on Heb. xi. 37, and in Otto's note on Justin. *Tryph.* 120.

were in their turn deduced from Scripture by scholastic Midrash.

These theological labours, which were always investigating old, and incessantly creating new material, were extended over the entire religious and ethical department. *It was owing to them that the whole circle of religious ideas in Israel had received in the times of Christ on the one hand a fanciful, on the other a scholastic character.* For the religious development was no longer determined and directed by the actual religious productivity of the prophets, but in part by the action of an unbridled imagination, not truly religious though dealing with religious objects, and in part by the scholastic reflection of the learned. Both these ruled and directed the development, in proportion as really religious life lost in inward strength.

It was in entire consistency with this tendency of the whole development, that special preference was shown for dealing with such *objects* as lay more at the circumference than in the centre of religious life, with the temporally and locally transcendent, with the *future* and the *heavenly* world. For the weaker the power of genuine religion, the more would fancy and reflection move from the centre to the circumference, and the more would such objects be detached from their central point and acquire an independent value and interest. The grace and glory of God were no longer seen in the present earthly world, but only in the future and heavenly world. Hence on the one side eschatology, on the other mythological theosophy, were cultivated with the greatest zeal. A copious abundance of notions concerning the realization of the salvation of Israel in a future period of the world's history was the growth of scientific investigation and unfettered religious fancy. The conditions, the premisses and the accompanying circumstances, under which the means and forces by which this salvation would be realized, were stated, and most especially was it declared wherein it would consist and how surpassing would be its glory; in a word, Messianic dogma was more and more carefully cultivated and extensively de-

veloped. So too was there much solicitous occupation with the heavenly world: the nature and attributes of God, heaven as his dwelling-place, the angels as His servants, the whole fulness and glory of the heavenly world; such were the objects to which learned reflection and inventive fancy applied themselves with special predilection. Philosophic problems were also discussed: how the revelation of God in the world was conceivable, how an influence of God upon the world was possible without His being Himself drawn down into the finite, how far there was room for evil in a world created and governed by God, and the like. Two portions of Holy Scripture in particular gave much scope for the development of theosophic speculation, these were the history of the creation (מַעֲשֵׂה בְּרֵאשִׁית) and the "chariot" of Ezekiel (מְרֻבֵּה), i.e. the introductory vision of Ezekiel, chap. i. In the explanation of these two portions, profound mysteries which, according to the view of scholars, ought to form an esoteric doctrine, were dealt with. "The history of the creation might not be explained before two, and the chariot not even before one, unless he were a scholar and could judge of it from his own knowledge."¹¹⁸ In these thus carefully guarded expositions of the history of the creation and of the chariot, we have the beginnings of those strange fancies concerning the creation and the spiritual world, which reached their climax in the so-called Kabbala of the Middle Ages.

The exposition and further development of the law was a process under comparatively strict regulations, but an almost unbridled caprice prevailed in the province of religious speculation. *Rules and method*, except in a very figurative sense, were here out of question. One thing especially, which made the development of the law so continuous and consequent, viz. the principle of a strict adherence to tradition, was here absent. The manipulator of the religious and ethical matter was not bound, like the interpreter of the law, to a strict

¹¹⁸ *Chagiga* ii. 1. Comp. also *Megilla* iv. 10. Further particulars in Herzfeld, iii. 410-424.

adherence to tradition. He might give his imagination free play, so long as its products would on the whole admit of being inserted in the frame of Jewish views. A certain tradition was indeed formed in this sphere also, but it was not binding. Religious *faith* was comparatively free, while *action* was all the more strictly shackled. With the absence moreover of the principle of tradition in this department all rules in general ceased. For there was really but one *rule* for the "investigator," viz. the right of making anything of a passage, which his wit and understanding enabled him. If nevertheless certain "rules" are laid down even for Haggadic interpretation, it was only that caprice here became methodical. A number of such rules for Haggadic exposition are met with among the thirty-two *Middoth* (hermeneutical principles) of R. Joses ha-Gelili, the age of which cannot indeed be more particularly determined.¹¹⁴ Later Judaism discovered that there is a fourfold meaning of Scripture, which is indicated in the word פֶּרֶשׁ (Paradise), viz. 1. פֶּשֶׁט, the simple or literal meaning; 2. רְמֵז (suggestion), the meaning arbitrarily imported into it; 3. דְּרִישׁ (investigation), the meaning deduced by investigation; and 4. סוּד (mystery), the theosophistic meaning.¹¹⁵

It would be a superfluous task to give examples in illustration of this kind of exegetical method, since we are sufficiently acquainted with it from the New Testament and the whole body of ancient Christian literature. For together with Holy

¹¹⁴ See the 22 Middoth, e.g. in Waehner, *Antiquitates Ebraeorum*, i. 396-421. Pinner, translation of the treatise *Berachoth*, Introd. fol 20^a-21^a. Pressel in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. xv. 658 sq. On the historical literature, comp. also Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 86. Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii. 108.

¹¹⁵ The initials of these four words produce the word פֶּרֶשׁ. I am unable to say how ancient this distinction of a fourfold meaning may be. Compare on this subject, Waehner, *Antiquitates Ebraeorum*, i. 353-357. Döpke, *Hermeneutik der neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller*, pp. 135-137. Deutsch, *Der Talmud* (1869), p. 16 sq. The distinction between רְמֵז and דְּרִישׁ is essentially the same as that between זִכָּר and רְאִיָּה, see note 85. above.

Scripture itself, its own mode of exegetical treatment was transferred by Judaism to the Christian Church. In saying this however it must also be remarked, that the exegetic method practised in the New Testament, when compared with the usual Jewish method, is distinguished from it by its great enlightenment. The apostles and the Christian authors in general were preserved from the extravagances of Jewish exegesis by the regulative norm of the gospel. And yet who would now justify such treatment of Old Testament passages, as are found *e.g.* in Gal. iii. 16, iv. 22–25; Rom. x. 6–8; Matt. xxii. 31–32? Jewish exegesis however, from which such a regulator was absent, degenerated into the most capricious puerilities.¹¹⁶ From its standpoint, *e.g.* the transposition of words into numbers, or of numbers into words, for the purpose of obtaining the most astonishing disclosures, was by no means strange, and quite in accordance with its spirit.¹¹⁷

With the comparatively great freedom allowed to development in the sphere of religious notions, it is not to be wondered, that *foreign influences* also made themselves felt with more or less power. Palestine had already been for a long time open to the general intercourse of the world. So early as the foundation of the great world-powers of the Assyrians,

¹¹⁶ Comp. generally the literature mentioned p. 269, especially Döpke, pp. 88–188. Hartmann, pp. 534–699. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i. 244 sqq. Hirschfeld, 1847. Welte in the *Tübinger Quartalschrift*, 1842. Hausrath, i. 97 sqq. Hamburger's article in the *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. On Philo's allegorical exposition of Scripture, see especially Gfrörer, *Philo*, i. 68–113. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. (3rd ed.), pp. 346–352. Siegfried, *Philo*, p. 160 sqq.

¹¹⁷ In an appendix to the Mishna, the statement, *e.g.*, that God will give to every righteous man 310 worlds as his inheritance, is proved by Prov. viii. 21: *יש לנהחיל אהבי יש*; because *יש* stands for 310 (*Ukzin* iii. 12; the passage is missing in the Cambridge MS. edited by Lowe). On the other hand, the author of the Epistle of Barnabas, who herein entirely follows the paths of Jewish exegesis, proves from the 318 servants of Abraham that Abraham had already in spirit beheld the cross of Jesus, because the number 18 = *IH* means the name Jesus, and the number 300 = *T* means the cross. *Barnab.* c. 9.

Chaldaeans and Persians, influences of the most varied kind had passed over the land. When it lay for two centuries under Persian supremacy, it would indeed have been very surprising if this fact had left behind it no kind of trace in the sphere of Israelitish intellectual life. Nor could it, with all its struggles for intellectual isolation, have possibly withdrawn itself entirely from the supremacy of the Greek spirit. Hence it cannot be denied that on the one hand Babylonian, on the other Greek influences are especially discernible in the development of Israel's religious notions. The amount of this influence may indeed be disputed. A careful investigation of details, especially in respect of the influence of Parseeism, has not as yet been made. This influence may perhaps have to be reduced to a comparatively small proportion. The fact however, that both Babylonian and Greek influences asserted themselves, is undeniable.¹¹⁸ At first sight indeed it seems strange, nay enigmatical, considering the high wall of partition which Judaism erected in respect of religion between itself and heathenism. There is however no need of appealing, in explanation to the circumstance, that such influences were felt at a time when this wall of partition was as yet no unscaleable one, for they continued to be exerted in later times also; ¹¹⁹ nor to the fact, that no wall of partition is strong enough to resist the power of intellectual influences. The deepest reason that can be offered in explanation is, on the contrary, that legal Judaism itself laid the chief stress upon correctness of *action*, and that comparatively free play was therefore permitted in the sphere of religious *notions*.

¹¹⁸ Compare with respect to Parseeism the certainly candid judgment of Lücke, *Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannes* (2nd ed.), p. 55 sq.: "The influence of the ancient Persian religion upon the development of Jewish religious notions . . . is an indisputable fact." On the influence of Hellenism upon the Palestinian Midrash, see Freudenthal, *Hellenistischen Studien* (1875), pp. 66-77. Siegfried, *Philo*, p. 283 sqq.

¹¹⁹ Angelology was far more strongly under the influence of Parseeism at the period of the Babylonian Talmud than previously. Comp. Kohut, *Ueber die jüdische Angelologie und Dämonologie*, 1866. The influences of Hellenism upon the Palestinian Midrash, pointed out by Freudenthal and

IV. THE MOST FAMOUS SCRIBES.

THE LITERATURE.

The older Hebrew works on the Mishna teachers in Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebr.* ii. 805 sq. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, ii. 48 sq.

Otto, *Historia doctorum misnicorum qua opera etiam synedrii magni Hierosolymitani praesides et vice-praesides recensentur*. Oxonii 1672 (frequently reprinted, e.g. also in Wolf's *Biblioth. Hebr.* vol. iv., and in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxi.).

Joh. Chrph. Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, ii. 805–865 (gives an alphabetical catalogue of the scholars mentioned in the Mishna).

Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iii. 226–263. The same, *Chronologische Ansetzung der Schriftgelehrten von Antigonos von Socho bis auf R. Akiba* (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1854, pp. 221–229, 273–277).

Kämpf, *Genealogisches und Chronologisches bezüglich der Patriarchen aus dem Hillel'schen Hause bis auf R. Jehuda ha-Nasi, den Redacteur der Mischnah* (*Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1853, pp. 201–207, 231–236; 1854, pp. 39–42, 98–107).

Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, vols. i. ii.

Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vols. iii. iv.

Derenbourg, *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine d'après les Thalmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques*. P. i.: *Histoire de la Palestine depuis Cyrus jusqu'à Adrien*. Paris 1867.

The works, written in Hebrew, of Frankel (1859), Brüll (1876) and Weiss (1871–1876). For further details concerning them, see the literature on the Mishna, § 3.

Friedländer, *Geschichtsbilder aus der Zeit der Tanaiten und Armoräer*, Brunn 1879 (a careless performance, see *Theol. Litztg.* 1880, p. 433).

Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii., the several articles.

Bacher, *Die Agada der Tanaiten* (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1882–1884). Also separately, *Die Agada der Tanaiten*, vol. i. 1884.

It is not till the period of the Mishna, i.e. about 70 A.D., that we have any detailed information concerning individual scribes. Of those who lived before this time, our knowledge is extremely scanty. This too is almost the case in respect of Hillel and Shammai, the famous heads of schools; for, setting aside what is purely legendary, our information concerning Siegfried, generally belong to a period when the religious seclusion had long been a very strict one.

them is comparatively small and unimportant. The names and order of the most celebrated heads of schools since about the second century after Christ have been handed down to us chiefly by the 1st chapter of the treatise *Aboth* (or *Pirke Aboth*), in which is enumerated the unbroken succession of individuals, who were from Moses till the time of the destruction of Jerusalem the depositaries of the traditions of the law. The whole chapter runs as follows:—¹²⁰

1. *Moses* received the law upon Sinai, and delivered it to Joshua; he to the elders; the elders to the prophets; and the prophets delivered it to the men of the *Great Assembly*. These laid down three rules: Be careful in pronouncing judgment! bring up many pupils! and make a fence about the law! 2. *Simon the Just* was one of the last of the *Great Assembly*. He said: The world subsists by three things—by the law, the worship of God, and benevolence. 3. *Antigonus of Socho* received the tradition from Simon the Just. He said: Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of reward, but be like those who do service without respect to recompense; and live always in the fear of God.

4. *Joses ben Jo eser* of Zereda and *Joses ben Johanan* of Jerusalem received the tradition from them. Joses ben Jo eser said: Let thy house be a place of meeting for the wise, dust thyself with the dust of their feet, and drink eagerly of their teaching. 5. Joses ben Johanan of Jerusalem said: Let thy house be always open (to guests), and let the poor be thy household. Avoid superfluous chatter with women. It is unbecoming with one's own wife, much more with the wife of another. Hence the wise also say: He who carries on useless conversation with a woman, brings misfortune upon

¹²⁰ The following translation is for the most part taken from the edition of the Mishna which has lately appeared under the management of Jost; but partly corrected according to the careful explanation of Cahn (*Pirke Aboth*, 1875). Comp. also for the exposition the editions of Surenhusius (*Mishna*, vol. iv.), P. Ewald (*Pirke Aboth*, 1825), Taylor (*Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, Cambridge 1877), and Strack (*Die Sprüche der Väter*, 1882).

himself, is hindered from occupation with the law, and at last inherits hell.

6. *Joshua ben Perachiah* and *Nithai of Arbela* received the tradition from these. The former said: Procure a companion (in study), and judge all men according to the favourable side.

7. *Nithai of Arbela* said: Depart from a bad neighbour; associate not with the ungodly; and think not that punishment will fail.

8. *Judah ben Tabbari* and *Simon ben Shetach* received the tradition from these. The former said: Make not thyself (as judge) an advocate. When both sides stand before thee, look upon both as in the wrong. But when they are dismissed and have received sentence, regard both as justified. 9. *Simon ben Shetach* said: Test the witnesses well, but be cautious in examination, lest they thereby learn to speak falsehood.

10. *Shemaiah* and *Abtalion* received from them. *Shemaiah* taught: Love work, hate authority, and do not press thyself upon the great. 11. *Abtalion* said: Ye wise, be cautious in your teaching, lest ye be guilty of error, and err towards a place of bad water. For your scholars, who come after you, will drink of it, die, and the name of God be thereby dishonoured.

12. *Hillel* and *Shammai* received from these. *Hillel* said: Be a disciple of Aaron, a lover of peace, a maker of peace, love men, and draw them to the law. 13. He was accustomed also to say: He who will make himself a great name, forfeits his own. He who does not increase his knowledge diminishes it, but he who seeks no instruction is guilty of death. He who uses the crown (of the law) (for external purposes) perishes. 14. The same said: Unless I (work) for myself, who will do so for me? And if I do so for myself alone, what am I? And if not now, when else? 15. *Shammai* said: Make the study of the law a decided occupation; promise little and do much; and receive every one with kindness.

16. *Rabban Gamaliel* said: Appoint yourself a teacher, you

thus avoid the doubtful; and do not too often tithe according to mere chance.

17. His son *Simon* said: "I have grown up from early youth among wise men, and have found nothing more profitable for men than silence. Study is not the chief thing, but practice. He who speaks much only brings sin to pass."

18. Rabban *Simon ben Gamaliel* said: The world subsists by three things—by the administration of justice, by truth, and by unanimity. (Thus also it is said, Zech. viii. 16: "Let peace and truth judge in your gates.")¹²¹

So far the Mishna. Among the authorities here specified, those which chiefly interest us are "the men of the great assembly," or of the *great synagogue* (אַנְשֵׁי כְנֶסֶת הַגְּדוֹלָה). They appear here as the depositaries of the tradition of the law between the last prophets and the first scribes known by name. Later Jewish tradition ascribes to them all kinds of legal enactments.¹²² Very recent, indeed really modern, is, on the other hand, the opinion, that they also composed the canon of the Old Testament.¹²³ As no authorities tell us who they really were, there has been the more opportunity for the most varying hypotheses concerning them.¹²⁴ The correct one, that they

¹²¹ The bracketed words are wanting in the best manuscripts, e.g. Berolin. MSS. fol. 567 (see Cahn, *Pirke Aboth*, p. 62), and *Cambridge University Additional*, 470. 1 (see Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, p. 4).

¹²² See Rau, *De synagoga magna*, pp. 6–24. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 244 sq. Kuenen, *Over de mannen der groote synagoge*, pp. 2–6. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, p. 124 sq. D. Hoffmann in the *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenth.* x. 1883, p. 45 sqq.

¹²³ This opinion became current chiefly through Elias Levita (sixteenth century), and was transferred from him to Christian theology. See Strack in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. vii. 416 sq. (art. "Kanon des Alten Testaments").

¹²⁴ See Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen*, pp. 120–166. The Introductions to the Old Testament, e.g. De Wette-Schrader, § 13. Heidenheim, *Untersuchungen über die Synagoga magna* (*Studien und Kritik*. 1853, pp. 286–300). Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, ii. 22–24, 380 sqq., iii. 244 sq., 270 sq. Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth.* i. 41–43, 91, 95 sq. Grätz, *Die grosse Versammlung* (*Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums*, 1857, pp. 31–37, 61–70). Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. xv. 296–299. Derenbourg, *Histoire de la*

never existed at all in the form which Jewish tradition represents, was already advocated by older Protestant criticism,¹²⁵ though it was reserved for the conclusive investigation of Kuenen to fully dissipate the obscurity resting upon this subject. The only historical foundation for the idea is the narrative in Neh. viii.-x., that in Ezra's time the law was solemnly accepted by a great assembly of the people. This "great assembly" was in fact of eminent importance to the maintenance of the law. But after the notion of a great assembly had been once fixed as an essential court of appeal for the maintenance of the law, an utterly non-historical conception was gradually combined therewith in tradition. Instead of an assembly of the people receiving the law, a college of individuals transmitting the law was conceived of, and this notion served to fill up the gap between the latest prophets and those scribes to whom the memory of subsequent times still extended.¹²⁶

Together with the notion of the great synagogue may be dismissed also the statement, that *Simon the Just* was one of its latest members. This Simon is, on the contrary, no other than the high priest Simon I. in the beginning of the third century before Christ, who, according to Josephus, obtained the surname *ὁ δίκαιος*.¹²⁷ Undoubtedly this name was con-

Palestine, pp. 29-40. Ginsburg in *Kitto's Cyclopaedia*, iii. 909 sqq. Neteler, *Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.* 1875, pp. 490-499. Bloch, *Studien zur Geschichte der Sammlung der althebräischen Literatur* (1876), pp. 100-132. Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. pp. 318-323. Montet, *Essai sur les origines des partis saducéen et pharisien* (1883), pp. 91-97. D. Hoffmann, *Ueber "die Männer der grossen Versammlung"* (*Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, 10th year, 1883, pp. 45-61). Strack in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. xv. 95 sq.

¹²⁵ Joh. Eberh. Rau, *Diatribe de synagoga magna*, Traj. ad Rh. 1726 Aurivillius, *Dissertationes ad sacras literas et philologiam orientalem pertinentes* (ed. Michaelis, 1790), pp. 139-160.

¹²⁶ See Kuenen, *Over de mannen der groote synagoge*, Amsterdam 1876 (separate reprint, *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde*, 2^{de} Reeks, Deel vi.). *Comp. Theol. Litztg.* 1877, p. 100.

¹²⁷ Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 2. 4.

ferred on him by the Pharisaic party on account of his strict legal tendencies, while most of the high priests of the Greek period left much to be desired in this respect. It was on this very account also that he was stamped by Jewish tradition as a vehicle of the tradition of the law.¹²⁸

The most ancient scribe of whom tradition has preserved at least the name is *Antigonus of Socho*. Little more than his name is however known of him.¹²⁹ The information too given in the Mishna of the subsequent scribes down to the time of Christ is extremely scanty and uncertain, as is indeed evident from the externally systematic grouping of them in five pairs. For there could hardly be historical foundation for such a fact as that in each generation only a pair of scholars should have specially distinguished themselves. It is likely that just *ten names* were known, and that these were formed into five pairs of contemporaries, after the analogy of the last and most famous pair, Hillel and Shammai.¹³⁰ In such a state of affairs, of course, only the most general outlines of the chronology can be determined. The comparatively most certain points are the following.¹³¹ Simon ben Shetach was a contemporary of Alexander Jannaeus and Alexandra, and therefore lived about 90–70 B.C.¹³² Hence the first pair must

¹²⁸ He is also mentioned in *Para* iii. 5 as one of the high priests under whom a red heifer was burnt. Comp. in general, Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebr.* ii. 864. Fürst's *Literaturbl. des Orients*, 1845, p. 33 sqq. Herzfeld, ii. 189 sqq., 377 (who in opposition to Josephus maintains that Simon II., the high priest at the close of the third century, is Simon the Just). Grätz, *Simon der Gerechte und seine Zeit* (*Monatsschrift*, 1857, pp. 45–56). Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, Div. ii. pp. 1115–1119. Montet, *Essai sur les origines*, etc. pp. 135–139.

¹²⁹ Comp. also Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebr.* ii. 813 sqq. Fürst's *Literaturbl. des Orients*, 1845, p. 36 sq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc. s.v.* In the *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan*, c. 5, two disciples, Zadok and Boethos, are ascribed to Antigonus, and the Sadducees and Boethosees traced to them.

¹³⁰ Hence these ten are in Rabbinical literature sometimes simply called "the pairs" (זוגות), e.g. *Pea* ii. 6.

¹³¹ Comp. on the chronology, Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 37, and Herzfeld in the *Monatsschrift f. Gesch. und Wissenschaft des Judenth.* 1854.

¹³² With this agrees the statement in *Taanith* iii. 8, that Simon ben Shetach

be placed two generations earlier, viz. about 150 B.C. Hillel is said, according to Talmudic tradition, to have lived 100 years before the destruction of Jerusalem, and thus to have flourished about the time of Herod the Great.¹²³ His supposed grandson, Gamaliel I., is mentioned in the Acts (v. 34, xxii. 3), about 30–40 A.D.¹²⁴ It has been already stated (p. 180 sq.) that subsequent tradition makes the whole five pairs *presidents and vice-presidents of the Sanhedrim*, and the utter erroneousness of this assertion is there pointed out. They were in fact nothing more than heads of schools.

The first pair, Joses ben Joaser and Joses ben Johanan, is only mentioned, besides the chief passage in the treatise *Aboth*, a few times more in the Mishna,¹²⁵ and still less frequently do we meet with the second pair, Joshua ben Perachiah and Nithai of Arbela.¹²⁶ Of the third pair only Simon ben Shetach has a somewhat tangible form, though what is related of him is for the most part of a legendary character.¹²⁷ There is no was a contemporary of the Onias so famed for his power in prayer, and whose death is related by Josephus, *Antt.* xiv. 2. 1, as taking place about 65 B.C.

¹²³ *Shabbath* 15^a. Hieronymus *ad Jesaj.* 11 sqq. (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, iv. 123): Sammai et Hillel non multo prius quam Dominus nasceretur orti sunt Judaea.

¹²⁴ *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 9; *Vita*, 38, 39, 44, 60.

¹²⁵ Both besides *Aboth* i. 4, 5 only in *Chagiga* ii. 2; *Sota* ix. 9. Joses ben Joaser also in *Chagiga* ii. 7; *Edujoth* viii. 4. According to *Chagiga* ii. 7, Joses ben Joaser was a priest, and indeed a pious one (חָסִיד) amongst the priesthood. The information in *Sota* ix. 9, that since the death of Joses ben Joaser and Joses ben Johanan, there had been no more אֲשֵׁכּוֹלוֹת, is obscure. Since the Mishna itself here refers to Micah vii. 1, it is probable that אֲשֵׁכּוֹלוֹת is to be taken in its usual signification (grapes), as a figurative designation of men who could afford mental refreshment. Others desire to take it like ἀρχολαί. Comp. Herzfeld, iii. 246–249. Derenbourg, pp. 65, 75, 456 sqq.

¹²⁶ The two only in *Aboth* i. 6, 7 and *Chagiga* ii. 2. Instead of Nithai (נִתְּאִי or נִתְּי) there is good testimony in both passages (*Cod. de Rossi* 138, *Cambridge University Additional*, 470. 1, also the Jerusalem Talmud, *Chagiga* ii. 2) for מִתְּאִי or מִתְּי, i.e. Matthew, which is perhaps preferable. The native place of Nithai (אֲרֵבֶל) is the present Irbid, north-west of Tiberias, where ruins of an ancient synagogue, the building of which is of course ascribed by tradition to Nithai, are still found (see § 27, note 89^a). Comp. Herzfeld, iii. 251 sq. Derenbourg, p. 93 sq.

¹²⁷ On his relations with Alexander Jannaeus and Alexandra, see above,

mention of any of them in Josephus. On the other hand, he seems to speak of the fourth pair, Shemaiah and Abtalion, under the names *Σαμέας* and *Πωλίον*. He tells us that when, in the year 47 B.C., the youthful Herod was accused before the Sanhedrim on account of his acts in Galilee, and all owners of property were silent through cowardly fear, that a certain *Sameas* alone raised his voice, and prophesied to his colleagues that they would yet all perish through Herod. His prophecy was fulfilled ten years later, when Herod, after his conquest of Jerusalem in the year 37, had all his former accusers executed.¹³⁸ Only the Pharisee Pollio and his disciple Sameas (*Πωλίον ὁ Φαρισαῖος καὶ Σαμέας ὁ τούτου μαθητής*) were spared, nay highly honoured by him, because during the siege by Herod they had given counsel, that the king should be admitted into the town. The Sameas here mentioned is expressly identified by Josephus with the former.¹³⁹ Lastly, Pollio and Sameas are mentioned by Josephus, and again in the same order, in a third passage. Unfortunately however we obtain no entire certainty as to time. For he informs us that the followers of Pollio and Sameas (*οἱ περὶ Πωλίωνα τὸν Φαρισαῖον καὶ Σαμέαν*) refused the oath of allegiance demanded of them by Herod, and were not punished on this account, "obtaining indulgence for the sake of Pollio" (*ἐντροπῆς διὰ τὸν Πωλίωνα τυχόντες*).¹⁴⁰ Josephus relates this among the events of the eighteenth year of Herod (= 20–19 B.C.). It cannot however be quite certainly determined from the context, whether this occurrence really took place in that year. Now the two names *Σαμέας* and *Πωλίον* so strikingly coincide with *שָׁמַיָא* and *פּוֹלִיּוֹן*, that the view of their being identical is very obvious.¹⁴¹ The

§ 10. Comp. beside *Aboth* i. 8–9, *Chagiga* ii. 2, also *Taanith* iii. 8, *Sanhedrin* vi. 4. Landau in the *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1853, pp. 107–122, 177–180. Herzfeld, iii. 251 sq. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vol. iii. 3rd ed. pp. 665–669 (note 14). Derenbourg, pp. 96–111.

¹³⁸ *Antt.* xiv. 9. 4.

¹³⁹ *Antt.* xv. 1. 1.

¹⁴⁰ *Antt.* xv. 10. 4.

¹⁴¹ The name *שָׁמַיָא*, which also frequently occurs in the Old Testament, especially in Nehemiah and Chronicles, is rendered in the LXX. by *Σαμαΐα*,

chronology too would about agree. The only thing that causes hesitation is, that Sameas is called the disciple of Pollio, while elsewhere Shemaiah stands before Abtalion. Hence we might feel tempted to identify Sameas with Shammai,¹⁴³ but that it would then be strange, that Josephus should mention him twice in connection with Abtalion, and not with his contemporary Hillel. If however by reason of this connection we take Hillel and Shammai to be meant by Pollio and Sameas,¹⁴³ there is against this identification, first the difference of the names Pollio and Hillel, and then the designation of Sameas as the disciple of Pollio, while Shammai was certainly no disciple of Hillel. All things considered, the connection of Sameas and Pollio with Shemaiah and Abtalion seems not only the more obvious, but the more probable.¹⁴⁴

Hillel and Shammai are by far the most renowned among the five pairs.¹⁴⁵ An entire school of scribes, who separated, if not in principle, yet in a multitude of legal decisions, in

Σαμαίας, Σαμείας and Σεμείας. The name Παλιών is not indeed identical with Abtalion, but, on the contrary, like the Latin Pollio. It is well known however, that besides their Hebrew, the Jews often bore like-sounding Greek or Latin names (Jesus and Jason, Saul and Paulus, etc.).

¹⁴² שמאי or שמיי (probably only an abbreviation of שמעיה, see Derenbourg, p. 95) may very well be rendered by Σαμείας in Greek, as נאי by Ιαννείας in *Antt.* xiii. 12. 1.

¹⁴³ So e.g. Arnold in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st. ed. vi. 97.

¹⁴⁴ Comp. on both, beside *Aboth* i. 10, 11 and *Chagiga* ii. 2, also *Edujoth* i. 3, v. 6. Landau in the *Monatsschrift für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1858, pp. 317–329. Herzfeld, iii. 253 sqq. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 3rd ed. iii. 671 sq. (note 17). Derenbourg, pp. 116–118, 149 sq., 463 sq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, Div. ii. p. 1113 sq. (art. "Semaja").

¹⁴⁵ On both, especially on Hillel, see Biesenthal in *Fürst's Literaturbl. des Orients*, 1848, Nos. 43–46. Kämpf in the same, 1849, Nos. 10–38. Arnold in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. 96–98 (and the older literature there cited). Herzfeld, iii. 257 sqq. Grätz, iii. 222 sqq. Jost, i. 255–270. Ewald, *Jahrb. der bibl. Wissenschaft*, vol. x. pp. 56–83. *Gesch. des Volkes Isr.* vol. v. 12–48. Geiger, *Das Judenthum und seine Gesch.* i. 99–107. Delitzsch, *Jesu und Hillel*, 1866 (2nd ed. 1867). Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, i. 268–272. Derenbourg, pp. 176–192. Strack in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. vi. 113–115. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 401–412. Bacher, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1882, pp. 100–110. Goitein, *Magazin für die Wissensch. des Judenth.* 11th year, 1884, pp. 1–16, 49–87.

two different directions, adhered to each of them. This circumstance certainly makes it evident, that both are of eminent importance in the history of Jewish law. Both indeed manifestly laboured with special zeal and ingenuity to give a more subtle completeness to the law, but it must not therefore be supposed, that their personal life and acts stand out in the clear light of history. What we know of them with certainty is comparatively very little. In the Mishna, the only trustworthy authority, they are each mentioned barely a dozen times.¹⁴⁶ And what we know of them from later sources bears almost always the impress of the legendary. Hillel, called "the elder," הלל,¹⁴⁷ to distinguish him from others, is said to have sprung from the family of David,¹⁴⁸ and to have immigrated from Babylon to Palestine. Being poor he was obliged to hire himself as a day-labourer to earn a living for himself and his family and to meet the expenses of instruction. His zeal for study was so great that on one occasion, not being able to pay the entrance-fee into the Beth-ha-Midrash, he climbed up to the window to listen to the instruction. As this happened in winter, he was frozen with cold, and was found in this position by his astonished teachers and colleagues.¹⁴⁹ Tradition tells strange things of the learning he acquired by such zeal. He understood all tongues, and even the language of the mountains, hills, valleys, trees, plants, of wild and tame animals and of daemons.¹⁵⁰ At all events he was the most celebrated jurist of his age, but he was no more president of the Sanhedrim than was any other learned

¹⁴⁶ Hillel is mentioned in the Mishna only in the following passages: *Shebi'ith* x. 3; *Chagiga* ii. 2; *Gittin* iv. 3; *Baba mezia* v. 9; *Edujoth* i. 1-4; *Aboth* i. 12-14, ii. 4-7, iv. 5, v. 17; *Arachin* ix. 4; *Nidda* i. 1. Shammai only in the following: *Maaser sheni* ii. 4, 9; *Orla* ii. 5; *Sukka* ii. 8; *Chagiga* ii. 2; *Edujoth* i. 1-4, 10, 11; *Aboth* i. 12, 15, v. 17; *Kelim* xxii. 4; *Nidda* i. 1.

¹⁴⁷ *Shebi'ith* x. 3; *Arachin* ix. 4.

¹⁴⁸ *Jer. Taanith* iv. 2, fol. 68a; *Bereshith rabba* c. 98, on Gen. xlix. 16 (see *Bereshith rabba*, translated by Wünsche, pp. 485, 557).

¹⁴⁹ Delitzsch, *Jesus und Hillel*, pp. 9-11.

¹⁵⁰ Delitzsch, *Jesus und Hillel*, p. 8.

scribe of the time. The leading features of his character were the gentleness and kindness of which singular proofs are related.¹⁵¹ It is manifested in the first of the maxims given above: "Be a disciple of Aaron, a lover and maker of peace, love men and attract them to the law." Shammai, noted for sternness, and also called "the elder," זקן, was the antipodes of the gentle Hillel.¹⁵² The following example of his rigorous zeal for the literal observance of the law is given in the Mishna. When his daughter-in-law brought forth a child on the feast of Tabernacles, he had the ceiling broken through and the roof over the bed covered with boughs, that the new-born child also might keep the feast according to the precept of the law.¹⁵³

The tendencies of their respective schools correspond with the mildness of Hillel and the strictness of Shammai. The school of Hillel decided legal questions in a mitigated, that of Shammai in an aggravated sense.¹⁵⁴ As they are however only minutiae on which the difference turns, it will not be worth while to follow the contrast into further details.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵¹ See Delitzsch, p. 31 sq.

¹⁵² *Orla* ii. 5; *Sukka* ii. 8.

¹⁵³ *Sukka* ii. 8.

¹⁵⁴ *Edujoth* iv. 1-12, v. 1-5.

¹⁵⁵ For the sake of those who may desire to go farther into the subject I here give all those passages in the Mishna in which differences between the two schools are mentioned. *Berachoth* i. 3, viii. 1-8; *Pea* iii. 1, vi. 1, 2, 5, vii. 6; *Demai* i. 3, vi. 6; *Kilajim* ii. 6, iv. 1, 5, vi. 1; *Shebi'ith* i. 1, iv. 2, 4, 10, v. 4, 8, viii. 3; *Terumoth* i. 4, v. 4; *Maaseroth* iv. 2; *Maaser sheni* ii. 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, iii. 6, 7, 9, 13, iv. 8, v. 3, 6, 7; *Challa* i. 6; *Orla* ii. 4; *Shabbath* i. 4-9, iii. 1, xxi. 3; *Erubin* i. 2, vi. 4, 6, viii. 6; *Pesachim* i. 1, iv. 5, viii. 8, x. 2, 6; *Shekalim* ii. 3, viii. 6; *Sukka* i. 1, 7, ii. 7, iii. 5, 9; *Beza* i. 1-9, ii. 1-5; *Rosh hashana* i. 1; *Chagiga* i. 1-3, ii. 3, 4; *Jebamoth* i. 4, iii. 1, 5, iv. 3, vi. 6, xiii. 1, xv. 2, 3; *Kethuboth* v. 6, viii. 1, 6; *Nedarim* iii. 2, 4; *Nasir* ii. 1, 2, iii. 6, 7, v. 1, 2, 3, 5; *Sota* iv. 2; *Gittin* iv. 5, viii. 4, 8, 9, ix. 10; *Kiddushin* i. 1; *Baba mezia* iii. 12; *Baba bathra* ix. 8, 9; *Edujoth* i. 7-14, iv. 1-12, v. 1-5; *Sebachim* iv. 1; *Chullin* i. 2, viii. 1, xi. 2; *Bechoroth* v. 2; *Kerithoth* i. 6; *Kelim* ix. 2, xi. 3, xiv. 2, xviii. 1, xx. 2, 6, xxii. 4, xxvi. 6, xxviii. 4, xxx. 8; *Ohaloth* ii. 3, v. 1-4, vii. 3, xi. 1, 3-6, 8, xiii. 1, 4, xv. 8, xviii. 1, 4, 8; *Para* xii. 10; *Tohoroth* ix. 1, 5, 7, x. 4; *Mikwaoth* i. 5, iv. 1, v. 6, x. 6; *Nidda* ii. 4, 6, iv. 3, v. 9, x. 1, 4, 6-8; *Machshirin* i. 2-4, iv. 4, 5, v. 9; *Sabim* i. 1-2; *Tebul jom* i. 1; *Jadajim* iii. 5; *Ukzin* iii. 6, 8, 11; *ביט שמתאי* only: *Berachoth* vi. 5; *Demai* iii. 1; *Kilajim* viii. 5; *Terumoth* iv. 3; *Orla* ii. 5, 12; *Beza* ii. 6;

Some examples may suffice. The command to prepare no food on the Sabbath was extended to laying-hens, and hence it was debated, whether and under what conditions an egg laid upon a holy day might or might not be eaten.¹⁵⁶ Or it was discussed, whether fringes, (Zizith) were needful or not to a square linen night-dress;¹⁵⁷ or whether on a holy day a ladder might be carried from one pigeon-house to another, or might only be slanted from one hole to another.¹⁵⁸ Of ideas of reformation, which Jewish self-love would so willingly have us believe in, there is not, as we see, a single word. In practice the milder school of Hillel gained in the course of years the upper hand, though in many points it voluntarily relinquished its own view and assented to those of the school of Shammai,¹⁵⁹ while in others neither the opinion of Hillel nor that of Shammai was subsequently followed.¹⁶⁰

An enactment, contrary indeed to the law, but authorized by the state of things, and certainly of salutary results, is connected with the name of Hillel. The legal appointment of a release of all debts every seventh year (Deut. xv. 1-11) entailed the evil consequence, "that people hesitated to lend each other money," although the law itself warned against backwardness in lending on account of this institution (Deut. xv. 9). In order then to do away with this evil, the so-called Prosbol (פרסבול = προσβολή), i.e. the delivery of a declaration,

Edujoth iii. 10; *Mikwaoth* iv. 5. This list of passages shows that the differences relate chiefly to the matters treated of in the first, second, third and fifth parts of the Mishna, i.e. (1) religious dues, (2) the Sabbaths and holy days, (3) the marriage laws, and (4) the laws of purification, and scarcely at all to those treated of in the fourth and fifth parts (civil and criminal law and the laws of sacrifice). The latter, which do not affect the religious acts of private individuals, but either purely civil or sacerdotal transactions, were not discussed with equal zeal in the schools. The civil and criminal law did not on the whole excite the same interest as religious decrees. It is however probable that the sacrificial laws had already been dealt with by the more ancient priestly scribes, and lay outside the direct sphere of Rabbinical authority.

¹⁵⁶ *Beza* i. 1; *Edujoth* iv. 1. Delitzsch, p. 21 sq.

¹⁵⁷ *Edujoth* iv. 10.

¹⁵⁸ *Beza* i. 3.

¹⁵⁹ *Edujoth* i. 12-14.

¹⁶⁰ *Et.g.* *Edujoth* i. 1-3. Comp. the passages cited in note 155.

or as we should say a registered declaration, was introduced by Hillel's influence.¹⁶¹ It was, that is to say, allowed to a creditor to make in court a declaration to the following effect: מִסֵּר אֲנִי לָכֶם אִישׁ פְּלוֹנִי וּפְלוֹנִי הַדִּינִים שֶׁבְּמִקְוִם פְּלוֹנִי שֶׁפֶּל חוֹב נָשִׂישׁ לִי שְׁאֲנִנְנִי כָּל יָמֵן שְׁאֲרָהָה, "I so and so deliver¹⁶² to you the judges of such and such a place (the declaration), that I may at any time I choose demand the payment of all my outstanding debts." Such a reservation made before a court secured the creditor even during the Sabbath year, and he needed not to be backward in lending money on its account. Thus credit was again laid upon a more solid foundation.¹⁶³

A Simon, said also to be the father of Gamaliel I., is generally named by both Jewish and Christian scholars as the son of Hillel. The existence of this Simon, and with him the whole genealogical relation, is however very questionable.¹⁶⁴ We do not reach a really historical personage till Gamaliel I., רַבֵּן גַּמְלִיאֵל הַקָּדוֹן, as he is called in the Mishna, in distinction from

¹⁶¹ According to others פְּרוֹחְבֹּל = πρὸς βουλῇ, which is however very improbable.

¹⁶² מִסֵּר, "to deliver" (whence also מִסִּרָה, tradition), answers to the Greek word προσβάλλειν.

¹⁶³ Comp. on the Prosbol especially, *Shebi'ith* x. 3-7 (the formula will be found *Shebi'ith* x. 4); the institution by Hillel, *Shebi'ith* x. 3; *Gittin* iv. 3; generally: *Pea* iii. 6; *Moed katan* iii. 3; *Kethuboth* ix. 9; *Ukzin* iii. 10. Such Prosbol declarations are indeed to be understood by the συμβόλαια τῶν δεδανεικόπων, which, according to Joseph. *Bell. Jud.*, were deposited among the archives at Jerusalem. Literature: Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 1806 sq. Guisius in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, i. 196. Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth.* i. 265 sq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 939 sq. (art. "Prosbol"). Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb. s.v.* פְּרוֹחְבֹּל.

¹⁶⁴ He is not mentioned in the Mishna at all. His name first occurs in the Babylonian Talmud, and there not as the son of Hillel, but only as holder of the dignity of Nasi between Hillel and Gamaliel I. The whole passage (*Shabbath* 15^a, below) is as follows: הלל ושמועון וגמליאל והמעתן. "Hillel and Simon, Gamaliel and Simon held the dignity of Nasi, during the time of the existence of the temple, for a hundred years," i.e. during the last hundred years before the destruction of the temple. Considering the worthlessness of this late Talmudic information, B. Lebrecht e.g. is quite justified in disputing the existence of this Simon altogether (Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben*, xi. 1875, p. 278, note). For older views of him, see Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebr.* ii. 861 sq.

Gamaliel II.¹⁶⁵ It was at his feet that the Apostle Paul sat (Acts xxii. 3); and it was he who once gave counsel in the Sanhedrim to release the accused apostles, since their work, if it were of man, would come to nought, while if it were of God, it was in vain to oppose it (Acts v. 34–39). Christian tradition has in consequence of this represented him as being a Christian,¹⁶⁶ while Jewish tradition glorifies him as one of the most celebrated teachers. “Since Rabban Gamaliel the elder died there has been no more reverence for the law (כְּבוֹד הַתּוֹרָה); and purity and abstinence (טְהוּרָה וּפְרִי־שָׁמַיִם) died out at the same time.”¹⁶⁷ That he was as little the president of the Sanhedrim

¹⁶⁵ *Orla* ii. 12; *Rosh hashana* ii. 5; *Jebamoth* xvi. 7; *Sota* ix. 15; *Gittin* iv. 2–3. In all these passages he is expressly called “the elder” (הַזֶּקֶן). Independently of *Aboth* i. 16, this elder Gamaliel is probably meant also in *Pea* ii. 6 and *Shekalim* vi. 1. In other passages this is doubtful. In particular the famous jurist Slav Tabi (טָבִי) was not in the service of the elder, but of the younger Gamaliel (*Berachoth* ii. 7; *Pesachim* vii. 2; *Sukka* ii. 1). Comp. in general, Graunii, *Historia Gamalielis*, Viteb. 1687. Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebraea*, ii. 821 sq. The same, *Curae philol. in Nov. Test.* on Acts v. 34. Palmer, *Paulus und Gamaliel*, Giessen 1806. Winer, *RWB.* i. 389. Pressel in Herzog’s *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. 656 sq. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 3rd ed. iii. 373 sqq. Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth.* i. 281 sqq., 423. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vi. p. 256 sq. Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, pp. 239–246. Schenkel in the *Bibellex.* ii. 328–330. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, Div. ii. art. “Gamaliel I.”

¹⁶⁶ *Clement. Recogn.* i. 65 sqq. Comp. also the narrative of the presbyter Lucianus of Jerusalem on the finding of the bones of the martyr Stephen (in Latin in Surius, *Vitae Sanctorum*, iv. 502 sqq. (3 August); Baronius, *Annal. ad ann.* 415, and in the Benedictine edition of Augustine, vol. vii. Appendix), according to which the bones of Nicodemus, Gamaliel and his son Abiba, who all here figure as Christians, were found at the same time as those of Stephen. This legend of Lucianus, which was already known to Gennadius, *Vitae*, 46, 47 (see also Fabricius, *Biblioth. graeca*, ed. Harles, x. 327), was drawn upon by the presbyter Eustratius of Constantinople, 6th century, in his book on the state of the dead, cap. 23 (published in Greek by Leo Allatius 1655; see Fabricius, *Bibl. gr.* x. 725, xi. 623). Lastly, Photius gives extracts from Eustratius in his *Bibliotheca cod.* 171. On a monument of the three saints, Gamaliel, Abibas and Nicodemus at Pisa, see Wagenseil on *Sota* ix. 15 (in Surenhusius’ *Mishna*, iii. 314 sq.). Comp. also Thilo, *Cod. apocr.* p. 501; Nilles, *Kalendarium Manuale* (1879), p. 232, and the literature there cited.

¹⁶⁷ *Sota* ix. 15. כְּבוֹד הַתּוֹרָה means “reverence for the law;” see Wagenseil in Surenhusius’ *Mishna*, iii. 312, n. 13, 315, ■ 20. Comp.

as Hillel was, appears from Acts v. 34 sqq., where he figures as a simple member of it. Much confusion concerning him has arisen, especially among Christian scholars, by attributing to him matters which apply to Gamaliel II., *e.g.* labours at Jabne and elsewhere.

His son Simon also enjoyed extraordinary fame as a scribe.¹⁶⁸ Josephus says of him: ¹⁶⁹ 'Ο δὲ Σίμων οὗτος ἦν πόλεως μὲν Ἱεροσολύμων, γένους δὲ σφόδρα λαμπροῦ, τῆς δὲ Φαρισαίων αἰρέσεως, οἱ περὶ τὰ πάτρια νόμιμα δοκοῦσι τῶν ἄλλων ἀκριβεῖα διαφέρειν. Ἦν δ' οὗτος ἀνὴρ πλήρης συνέσεώς τε καὶ λογισμοῦ, δυνάμενός τε πράγματα κακῶς κείμενα φρονήσει τῇ ἑαυτοῦ διορθώσασθαι. He lived at the time of the Jewish war, and during its first period (A.D. 66–68) took a prominent part in the conduct of affairs. Still neither was he at any time president of the Sanhedrim.

Of profound importance to the further development of scribism was the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the hitherto relative independence of the Jewish commonwealth. The ancient Sanhedrin, at the head of which had stood the Sadducean high priests, now for ever retired from the stage. The Pharisaic teachers of the law, who during the last century before the destruction of the temple had already actually exercised very great influence, became the sole leaders of the people. Hence the direct result of the political fall was an increase of Rabbinical power and an exaltation of Rabbinical studies. Henceforth our authorities became more copious,—the first codification of Jewish law having been undertaken by men directly connected with the generation which survived the fall of the city.

Nedarim ix. 1: כבוד אביו = "respect towards his father." So too *Aboth* iv. 12. The sense thus is, that no one any longer had such reverence for the law as Rabban Gamaliel the elder.

¹⁶⁸ Comp. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 9; *Vita*, 38, 39, 44, 60. Jost, i. 446 sqq. Derenbourg, pp. 270–272, 474 sq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 1121. By the Rabban Simon ben Gamaliel, so frequently mentioned in the Mishna, is generally intended the son of Gamaliel II. So especially in *Aboth* i. 18; *Kerithoth* i. 7 alone, besides *Aboth* i. 17, refers perhaps to Simon the son of Gamaliel I.

¹⁶⁹ *Vita*, 38.

Jamnia or *Jabne*, which had since the Maccabæan period been chiefly inhabited by Jews, became after the destruction of the holy city a chief seat of these studies. The most distinguished of those scholars, who survived the fall of Jerusalem, seem to have settled here.¹⁷⁰ Lydda or Lud is besides mentioned as an abode of eminent scribes.¹⁷¹ Later on, perhaps subsequent to the middle of the second century after Christ, Tiberias became a centre of scribism.

The most important scribe in the decade after the destruction of Jerusalem was Rabban Johanan ben Sakkai.¹⁷² The period of his activity is evident from the circumstance, that he altered several legal enactments or customs "after the temple was destroyed."¹⁷³ His place of residence seems to have been chiefly *Jabne*.¹⁷⁴ But *Berur Chail* (ברור חיל) is also mentioned as a scene of his labours.¹⁷⁵ And he must likewise have temporarily sojourned in *Arab* (ערב), where various legal questions were propounded for his decision.¹⁷⁶ Among

¹⁷⁰ See in general, *Shekalim* i. 4; *Rosh hashana* ii. 8-9, iv. 1-2; *Kethuboth* iv. 6; *Sanhedrin* xi. 4; *Edujoth* ii. 4; *Aboth* iv. 4; *Bechoroth* iv. 5, vi. 8, *Kelim* v. 4; *Para* vii. 6.

¹⁷¹ *Rosh hashana* i. 6; *Taanith* iii. 9; *Baba mezia* iv. 3; *Jadajim* iv. 3.

¹⁷² See concerning him the Hebrew works of Frankel, Brüll and Weiss (titles above, § 3), also Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Sekten*, ii. 13 sqq. Landau, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1851-52, pp. 163-176. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 10 sqq. Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, pp. 266 sq., 276-288, 302-318. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, Div. ii. pp. 464-473. Bacher, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1882, pp. 145-165. Spitz, *Rabban Johanan ben Sakkai, Rector der Hochschule zu Jabneh*, Dissertation, Leipzig 1883. He is mentioned in the Mishna in the following passages: *Shabbath* xvi. 7, xxii. 3; *Shekalim* i. 4; *Sukka* ii. 5, iii. 12; *Rosh hashana* iv. 1, 3; *Kethuboth* xiii. 1-2; *Sota* v. 2, 5, ix. 9, 15; *Edujoth* viii. 3, 7; *Aboth* ii. 8-9; *Menachoth* x. 5; *Kelim* ii. 2, xvii. 16; *Jadajim* v. 3, 6. Only as זכאי, *Sanhedrin* v. 2. For the passages in the Tosefta, see the index to Zuckermann's edition.

¹⁷³ *Sukka* iii. 12; *Rosh hashana* iv. 1, 3, 4; *Menachoth* x. 5.

¹⁷⁴ *Shekalim* i. 4; *Rosh hashana* iv. 1.

¹⁷⁵ *Sanhedrin* 32b; Tosefta, *Maaseroth*, 82. 13 (comp. *Jer. Demai* iii. 1, fol. 23b; *Jer. Maaseroth* ii. 3, fol. 49d). Derenbourg, 307. Many, as e.g. B. Derenbourg, are of opinion that Johanan ben Sakkai was driven from *Jabne* by Gamaliel II. and retired to *Berur Chail*.

¹⁷⁶ *Shabbath* xvi. 7, xxii. 3. *Arab* is a small town in Galilee not far from *Sepphoris*. See Derenbourg, *Histoire*, p. 318, note 3.

his legal innovations perhaps the most prominent is his doing away with the water of bitterness to be drunk by one accused of adultery.¹⁷⁷ How closely connected he still was with matters as they were before the destruction of Jerusalem, is seen by the fact of his disputing concerning legal questions with Sadducees,¹⁷⁸ who soon after it disappear from history. He is also the vehicle of ancient traditions which are referred to Moses himself.¹⁷⁹ Legend tells us of him what Josephus tells us of himself, viz. that he predicted to Vespasian his future elevation to the imperial dignity.¹⁸⁰ R. Elieser ben Hyrkanos, R. Joshua ben Chananiah, R. Jose the priest, R. Simon ben Nathanael and R. Eleasar ben Arach are named in the Mishna as his five disciples.¹⁸¹ The best known and most eminent are the two first named, R. Elieser and R. Joshua.

R. Zadok, or as his name would be more correctly pronounced, R. Zadduk,¹⁸² was about contemporary with Rabban Johanan ben Sakkai. He is said to have lived before the destruction of the temple, and also to have held intercourse with Gamaliel II., Joshua and Elieser.¹⁸³ He is in fact often mentioned in conjunction with them in the Mishna.¹⁸⁴ In

¹⁷⁷ *Sota* ix. 9. Nine decrees (תקנות) introduced by him are enumerated in the Talmud, *Rosh hashana* 31^b; *Sota* 40^a. Derenbourg, p. 304 sq.

¹⁷⁸ *Jadajim* iv. 6.

¹⁷⁹ *Edujoth* viii. 7; *Jadajim* iv. 3, *fin.* Comp. above, p. 272.

¹⁸⁰ *Midrash rabba* on Lam. 1, 5. Derenbourg, p. 282 sq.; Wünsche, *Der Midrash Echa rabbati* (1881), p. 66 sqq.

¹⁸¹ *Aboth* ii. 8-9. The abbreviation R means Rabbi, while the higher title Rabban is generally written in full.

¹⁸² See concerning him, Derenbourg, pp. 342-344. Bacher, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1882, pp. 208-211. In the Mishna, *Terumoth* x. 9; *Pesachim* vii. 2; *Sukka* ii. 5; *Nedarim* ix. 1; *Edujoth* iii. 8, vii. 1-4; *Aboth* iv. 5; *Bechoroth* i. 6; *Kelim* xii. 4-5; *Mikwaoth* v. 5. On *Shabbath* xx. 2, xxiv. 5, comp. note 185. For the passages in the Tosefta, see the index to Zuckerman's edition. The pronunciation Zadduk is pointed according to the *Cod. de Rossi* 138. Comp. Σαδδούκ in the LXX. in Ezekiel, Ezra and Nehemiah.

¹⁸³ Proofs of both in Derenbourg and Bacher's above-named works.

¹⁸⁴ With Gamaliel II., *Pesachim* vii. 2; with Joshua, *Edujoth* vii. 1 = *Bechoroth* i. 6; with Elieser, *Nedarim* ix. 1.

certain passages, according to which the date of his life would have to be considerably postponed, a subsequent R. Zadok is probably intended.¹⁸⁵

To the first decades after the destruction of the temple belongs also a distinguished priestly scribe, R. Chananiah, "president of the priests" (סֵן הַכֹּהֲנִים).¹⁸⁶ He relates what his father had done, and what he had himself seen in the temple,¹⁸⁷ and appears in the Mishna almost entirely as a narrator of the details of the priestly ritual.¹⁸⁸ It is characteristic of him as an eminent priest, that he exhorts to prayer for the welfare of the heathen authorities.¹⁸⁹

R. Elieser ben Jacob¹⁹⁰ also belongs to the first generation after the destruction of the temple. For it is very probable that a former scribe of the same name must be distinguished from the considerably later R. Elieser ben Jacob so frequently quoted in the Mishna. He flourished not long after the destruction of the temple,¹⁹¹ in which his uncle had ministered as a Levite,¹⁹² and he is frequently quoted as an authority in the treatise *Middoth*; ¹⁹³ nay, subsequent tradition

¹⁸⁵ So *Shabbath* xx. 2, xxiv. 5. Comp. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1882, p. 215. If we acknowledge the existence of this subsequent R. Zadok, the question of course arises, whether other passages must not also be referred to him.

¹⁸⁶ See Derenbourg, pp. 368–370. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 131, and Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1882, pp. 216–219. His name according to the best authorities is not Chanina but Chananiah (so *Cod. de Rossi* 138, and the Cambridge MS. edited by Lowe). On the office of a priestly סֵן, see above, p. 259.

¹⁸⁷ *Sebachim* ix. 3, xii. 4.

¹⁸⁸ See in general, *Pesachim* i. 6; *Shekalim* iv. 4, vi. 1; *Edujoth* ii. 1–3; *Aboth* iii. 2; *Sebachim* ix. 3, xii. 4; *Menachoth* x. 1; *Negaim* i. 4; *Para* iii. 1.

¹⁸⁹ *Aboth* iii. 2.

¹⁹⁰ Derenbourg, p. 374 sq. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1882, pp. 228–233.

¹⁹¹ So also Derenbourg, 375, n. 2, and Bacher, 228. The younger Elieser ben Jacob was a contemporary of R. Simon about A.D. 150 (*Para* ix. 2), and narrates in the name of Chananiah ben Chakinai, who again narrates in that of R. Akiba (*Kilajim* iv. 8. Tosefta, *Negaim* 617. 38; *Tohoroth* 672. 15, ed. Zuckermann).

¹⁹² *Middoth* i. 2.

¹⁹³ *Middoth* i. 2, 9, ii. 5, 6, v. 4. Comp. *Shekalim* vi. 3.

even ascribes to him the composition of the whole treatise.¹⁹⁴ It can no longer be decided in particular cases which passages are to be attributed to him and which to R. Elieser ben Jacob the younger. Perhaps the statements on circumstances of ritual may be referred to the elder.¹⁹⁵

Rabban Gamaliel II., son of Simon and grandson of Gamaliel I., the most renowned scholar of the turn of the century (about A.D. 90–110), lived only a few decades later than Johanan ben Sakkai.¹⁹⁶ The tribunal at Jabne, of which he was the head, was in his days generally acknowledged as the chief authority in Israel.¹⁹⁷ The most famous scholars were here assembled about him, and in this respected circle Gamaliel was reckoned the decisive authority.¹⁹⁸ Among the scholars in close intercourse with him, R. Joshua, about his equal in age, and R. Akiba, his junior, were the most eminent.¹⁹⁹ On the other hand, Gamaliel does not seem to have entered into close relations with his famous contem-

¹⁹⁴ *Joma* 16a. Derenbourg, 374, n. 1.

¹⁹⁵ *E.g.* the statements concerning the marriages of priests (*Bikkurim* i. 5; *Kiddushin* iv. 7), the sacrificial rites (*Menachoth* v. 6, ix. 3; *Tamid* v. 2), the first-born of cattle (*Bechoroth* iii. 1), the sacred singers (*Arachin* ii. 6), the offerings of proselytes (*Kerithoth* ii. 1).

¹⁹⁶ See concerning him the Hebrew works of Frankel, Brüll and Weiss, also Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth.* ii. 25 sqq. Landau, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1851–52, pp. 283–295, 323–335. Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iv. 30 sqq., 423 sq. Derenbourg, pp. 306–313, 319–346. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 237–250. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1882, pp. 245–267. The chronology results from the fact that his younger contemporary Akiba played a part in the Barkochba war.

¹⁹⁷ *Rosh hashana* ii. 8–9; *Kelim* v. 4. Comp. Derenbourg, pp. 319–322. He seems to have sojourned but temporarily at Kefar-Othnai, where we only once (*Gittin* i. 5) meet with Gamaliel.

¹⁹⁸ Hence when once during a protracted absence of Gamaliel it had to be decided, whether the year was to be a leap year, this was only done with the reservation that Gamaliel should agree to it (*Edujoth* vii. 7). Comp. also for the authoritative position of Gamaliel, the formula “Rabban Gamaliel and the elders” (*Maaser sheni* v. 9; *Shabbath* xvi. 8; *Erubin* x. 10).

¹⁹⁹ On the mutual relations of Gamaliel, Joshua and Akiba, comp. especially, *Maaser sheni* v. 9; *Erubin* iv. 1; *Rosh hashana* ii. 8–9; *Maaser sheni* ii. 7; *Sukka* iii. 9; *Kerithoth* iii. 7–9; *Negaim* vii. 4. Gamaliel and Joshua, *Jadajim* iv. 4. Gamaliel and Akiba, *Rosh hashana* i. 6; *Jebamoth* xvi. 7.

porary R. Elieser ben Hyrcanus. At least there is no trace of this in the Mishna, while subsequent tradition on the contrary relates that Elieser was excommunicated by Gamaliel (see below). Gamaliel once undertook in conjunction with R. Joshua, R. Akiba and the equally renowned R. Eleasar ben Asariah, a sea voyage to Rome, which obtained a certain celebrity in Rabbinical literature.²⁰⁰ He is said to have been on one occasion removed by the seventy-two elders from the presidential dignity on account of his too autocratic dealings, and R. Eleasar ben Asariah to have been appointed to replace him. Gamaliel was however, on showing contrition, soon reinstated in his office, which Eleasar voluntarily vacated.²⁰¹ The elevation of Eleasar by the seventy-two elders to the headship of the school is at any rate evidenced by the Mishna.²⁰² In his legal decisions Gamaliel followed the school of Hillel; it is mentioned as an exception, that in three things he decided in an aggravated sense, according to the school of Shammai.²⁰³ In general he is characterized as much by legal strictness on the one hand,²⁰⁴ as on the other by a certain amount of worldly conformity, nay of candour of judgment.²⁰⁵

The two most celebrated contemporaries of Gamaliel were R. Joshua ben Chananiah and R. Elieser ben Hyrcanus, both pupils of Johanan ben Sakkai.²⁰⁶ We frequently find them disputing with each other on legal questions, and Akiba the

²⁰⁰ *Erubin* iv. 1-2; *Maaser sheni* v. 9; *Shabbath* xvi. 8. Grätz, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1851-52, pp. 192-202. Derenbourg, pp. 334-340. Renan, *Les évangiles* (1877), p. 307 sqq. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1882, p. 251 sqq.

²⁰¹ *Jer. Berachoth* iv. 1, fol. 7^{cd}; *Bab. Berachoth* 27^b (in German in Pinner, *Talmud Babli Tractat Berachoth*, 1842, in Latin in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. 337, iii. 247). Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth.* ii. 28 sqq. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 35 sqq. Derenbourg, pp. 327-329.

²⁰² *Sebachim* i. 3; *Jadajim* iii. 5, iv. 2.

²⁰³ *Beza* ii. 6; *Edujoth* iii. 10.

²⁰⁴ *Berachoth* ii. 5-6.

²⁰⁵ Comp. beside the journey to Rome, his intercourse with the governor (hegemôn) of Syria (*Edujoth* vii. 7) and his visit to the bath of Aphrodite at Akko, although there was there a statue of the heathen goddess (*Aboda sara* iii. 4).

²⁰⁶ *Aboth* ii. 8. Comp. *Edujoth* viii. 7; *Jadajim* iv. 3, *fta.*

younger taking part in these discussions.²⁰⁷ With Gamaliel however Joshua only, and not Elieser, seems to have been in familiar intercourse. According to later tradition this would be explained by the fact that Elieser was excommunicated by Gamaliel.²⁰⁸ R. Joshua was descended from a Levitical family.²⁰⁹ He was of a gentle and yielding disposition, and hence submitted to the unbending Gamaliel.²¹⁰ "Since the death of R. Joshua, there is no longer any kind-heartedness (טובה) in the world."²¹¹ His motto was, "Envy, evil desire and hatred bring a man out of the world."²¹² Pekiin or Bekiin (בקיעין, עקיעין), is named as the place of his labours.²¹³ His close relations with Gamaliel however lead to the conclusion that he also resided partly at Jabne. Tradition relates of him, among other things, that he had various conversations with the Emperor Hadrian on religious subjects.²¹⁴ In contrast with the yielding Joshua, Elieser was of a firm, unbending character, and a very strict adherent to tradition, over which, by reason of his faithful memory and extensive scholarship, he had more influence than any other.²¹⁵ His teacher

²⁰⁷ On the mutual relations of Joshua, Elieser and Akiba, comp. especially *Pesachim* vi. 2; *Jebamoth* viii. 4; *Nedarim* x. 6; *Nasir* vii. 4; *Edujoth* ii. 7. On Joshua and Elieser, *Pesachim* vi. 5; *Taanith* i. 1; *Sebachim* vii. 4, viii. 10; *Nasir* vii. 4. On Joshua and Akiba, *Pesachim* ix. 6; *Sanhedrin* vii. 11. On Elieser and Akiba, *Pea* vii. 7; *Kerithoth* iii. 10; *Shebiith* viii. 9-10.

²⁰⁸ *Jer. Moed Katan* iii. 1, fol. 81^d; *Bab. Baba mezia* 59^b; Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth.* ii. 35. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 47. Derenbourg, 324 sq.

²⁰⁹ This appears from *Maaser sheni* v. 9. Comp. on Joshua, the Hebrew works of Frankel, Brüll and Weiss; also Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 50 sqq., 426 sq. Derenbourg, pp. 319 sqq., 416 sqq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 510-520. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1882, pp. 340-359, 433-464, 481-496.

²¹⁰ *Rosh hashana* ii. 8-9. Derenbourg, 325-327.

²¹¹ *Sota* ix. 15.

²¹² *Aboth* ii. 11: הרע ויצר הרע ושנאת הבריות.

²¹³ עין הרע ויצר הרע, *Sanhedrin* 32; Tosefta, *Sota* 307, 8. בקיעין, *Jer. Chagiga* i. 1. Derenbourg, 307.

²¹⁴ Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1882, pp. 461 sqq., 481 sqq.

²¹⁵ See the Hebrew works of Frankel, Brüll and Weiss; also Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 43 sq., 425 sq. Derenbourg, 319 sqq., 366 sqq. Hamburger, ii. 162-168. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1882, pp. 289-315, 337-359, 433-445.

Johanan ben Sakkai boasted of him, that he was like a well coated with lime, which does not loose a single drop.²¹⁶ He was not to be moved by any reasons or representations from what he knew as tradition. Hence his strained relations with Gamaliel, although he is said to have been his brother-in-law.²¹⁷ His dwelling-place was Lydda.²¹⁸ The strange opinion of a modern scholar, that he was inclined to Christianity, nay was secretly a Christian,²¹⁹ rests upon a legend which really proves the contrary. Elieser is at one time brought before a heathen tribunal, and looks upon this as a just punishment of God for his having been pleased with the ingenious solution of a legal question, which a Jewish Christian had communicated to him as having been derived from Jesus.²²⁰

R. Eleasar ben Asariah,²²¹ a rich and eminent priest, whose genealogy is traced back to Ezra, also occupies an honourable position together with those last mentioned.²²² His wealth was so great, that it was said that after his death there was no longer any wealth among the learned.²²³ His relations with Gamaliel, Joshua and Akiba, his journey with them to Rome, his elevation by the seventy-two elders to the office of president, and his voluntary relinquishment of this position have been already spoken of. It is evident even from

²¹⁶ *Aboth* ii. 8.

²¹⁷ *Shabbath* 116a. Derenbourg, 323.

²¹⁸ *Jadajim* iv. 3; *Sanhedrin* 32b. Derenbourg, 307.

²¹⁹ Toettermann, R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanos sive de vi qua doctrina Christiana primis seculis illustrissimos quosdam Judaeorum attraxit, Lipsiae 1877. Comp. *Theol. Litztg.* 1877, pp. 687-689.

²²⁰ There are two versions of this legend: (1) *Aboda sara* 16b in German in Ewald's *Aboda sarah oder der Götzendienst*, 1868, pp. 120-122; (2) *Midrash rabba* on Eccles. i. 8 in German in Wünsche, *Der Midrasch Koheleth*, 1880, p. 14 sq. See in general, Jost, ii. 41 sq. Grätz, iv. 47 sq. Derenbourg, 357-360. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1882, p. 301.

²²¹ See concerning him, Derenbourg, 327 sqq. Hamburger, ii. 156-158. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1883, pp. 6-27. According to the best authorities, his name is not Elieser but Eleasar (in the *Cod. de Rossi* 138, and in the Cambridge MS. generally, לעזר).

²²² Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1883, p. 7. That he was a priest is clear from *Maaser sheni* v. 9

²²³ *Sota* ix. 15.

these personal circumstances that he must have laboured in Jabne, a fact also testified elsewhere.²²⁴ He was also in personal relation with R. Ishmael and R. Tarphon, the contemporaries of Akiba.²²⁵

R. Dosa ben Archinos (or Harkinos) was another contemporary of Gamaliel and Joshua.²²⁶ Of him it is especially stated, that he induced Joshua to submit to Gamaliel.²²⁷

Among the later men of this generation is also Eleasar ben Zadok, son of the already mentioned R. Zadok.²²⁸ The son was, as well as the father, intimately acquainted with Gamaliel, and hence gives information concerning his enactments and the legal customs of his house.²²⁹

R. Ishmael occupies an independent position among the scribes of the time.²³⁰ We find him indeed occasionally in Jabne.²³¹ He was also intimate with his renowned contemporaries R. Joshua, Eleasar ben Asariah, Tarphon, and

²²⁴ *Kethuboth* iv. 6. Some sentences of Eleasar in *Aboth* iii. 17.

²²⁵ A disputation between him, Tarphon, Ishmael and Joshua is given *Jadajim* iv. 3. Eleasar and Ishmael in *Tosefta*, *Berachoth* 1, lin. 15, ed. Zuckermannel. Eleasar and Akiba, *Tosefta*, *Berachoth* i. 12; *Shabbath* 113. 23.

²²⁶ See Derenbourg, 368 sq., 370 sq. Hamburger, ii. 155. His name is, in *Cod. de Rossi* 138, ארכינס, elsewhere generally הרבינס, but is in any case not like Hyrcanus, but Archinos.

²²⁷ *Rosh hashana* ii. 8-9. Comp. also *Erubin* iii. 9; *Kethuboth* xiii. 1-2; *Edujoth* iii. 1-6; *Aboth* iii. 10; *Chullin* xi. 2; *Ohaloth* iii. 1; *Negaim* i. 4.

²²⁸ See concerning him, Derenbourg, pp. 342-344. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1082, pp. 211-215. As in the case of R. Zadok, so probably in that of Eleasar ben Zadok, we must distinguish between two scribes of the same name, an older and a younger (so Frankel, *Darke hamishna*, pp. 98, 178; Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1882, p. 215; otherwise Derenbourg, p. 262, n. 2, 344, n. 4). The younger relates in the name of R. Meir (*Kilajim* vii. 2), and therefore did not live till the middle of the second century. The name of both is according to the best authority not Elieser but Eleasar (*Cod. de Rossi* 138, and the Cambridge MS. have chiefly לעזר).

²²⁹ *Tosefta*, *Challa* 99. 9; *Shabbath* iii. 15; *Jom. tob.* 202. 28, 204. 15-16; *Kiddushin* 336. 13 (ed. Zuckermannel).

²³⁰ See concerning him, Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 60 sqq., 427 sqq. Derenbourg, pp. 386-395; Hamburger, ii. 526-529. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1883, pp. 63 sqq., 116 sqq., 209 sqq. On the school of Ishmael, D. Hoffmann, *Magazin für die Wissensch. des Judenth.* xi. 1884, pp. 17-30.

²³¹ *Edujoth* ii. 4.

Akiba.²³² His usual dwelling was however in the south of Palestine on the borders of Edom, in the village of Kephar-Asis (כפר עזיז), where Joshua once visited him.²³³ He seems, judging from his age, to have stood in nearer relation to Tarphon and Akiba than to Joshua; he questioned Joshua, and went "behind him" (like a pupil), while he was on equal terms with Tarphon and Akiba.²³⁴ It would be of special interest, if his father really did, as tradition asserts, also exercise the functions of high priest. The matter is however more than questionable, and only so far probable that he was of priestly descent.^{234a} In the history of the Halachah, Ishmael represents a special tendency: in opposition to the artificial and arbitrary exegesis of Akiba, he adhered more to the simple and literal meaning of Scripture, but this must be understood in only a very comparative sense.²³⁵ The laying down of the *thirteen Middoth*, or exegetic rules for Halachic exegesis, is ascribed to him.²³⁶ A large portion of the exegetic material contained in two of the oldest Midrashim (*Mechilta* on Exodus, and *Sifre* on Numbers and Deuteronomy) comes from him and his disciples, even if these are not, as tradition asserts, the exclusive production of his school.²³⁷ According to the legend, Ishmael,

²³² Joshua and Ishmael, *Kilajim* vi. 4; *Aboda sara* ii. 5; *Tosefta*, *Para* 638. 35. Akiba and Ishmael, *Edujoth* ii. 6; *Mikwaoth* vii. 1. On a disputation between Tarphon, Eleasar ben Asariah, Ishmael and Joshua, see *Jadajim* iv. 3. But that Joshua and Ishmael *e.g.* did not live in the same place is seen from *Kilajim* vi. 4; *Tosefta*, *Bechoroth* 536. 24. The same is evident with respect to Akiba from *Erubin* i. 2; *Tosefta*, *Sabim* 677. 6 (pupils of Ishmael are reporting to Akiba the instruction of the former).

²³³ On the borders of Edom, *Kethuboth* v. 8; in Kephar-Asis, *Kilajim* vi. 4; on Kephar-Asis, comp. *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Kitchener and Conder, iii. 315, 348-350. *Mikwaoth* vii. 1, according to which people of Medaba, the well-known Moabite town, relate concerning his teaching, points to labours in Peraea.

²³⁴ Compare the passages cited in note 232. With respect to Joshua, *Aboda sara* ii. 5; *Tosefta*, *Para* 638. 35. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1883, p. 64.

^{234a} Derenbourg, p. 387 sq.

²³⁵ Comp. briefly, Hamburger, p. 528. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1883, p. 73 sq.

²³⁶ See above, p. 336; and Derenbourg, pp. 389-391.

²³⁷ The tradition is reduced to its true proportion *e.g.* in Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1883, p. 66 sq. Comp. also on the two Midrashim, § 3, above

like most of his contemporaries, is said to have died as a martyr in the Barkochba war.²³⁸

Among those scribes who also had intercourse with Gamaliel, Joshua and Elieser, but stood more or less in a relation of discipleship to them, by far the most celebrated was R. Akiba ben Joseph.²³⁹ He flourished about A.D. 110–135. His relations with Gamaliel, Joshua and Elieser have already been spoken of (notes 199, 200, 207). He surpassed them all in influence and reputation. None gathered about him so large a number of pupils;²⁴⁰ none was so glorified by tradition. It is scarcely possible however to pluck the historically true from the garland of myths. Not even the place of his labours is known with certainty; from the Mishna it seems to have been Lydda,²⁴¹ while the Babylonian Talmud names Bene-Barak (בני ברק).²⁴² Such sentences of his as have been handed down are not only characteristic of his rigidly legal standpoint, but also show that he made dogmatic and philosophic questions the subjects of study.²⁴³ Like the ancient Zealots, he combined national patriotism with religious zeal. Hence he hailed the political hero Barkochba as the Messiah,²⁴⁴ and is said to have suffered martyrdom as one of the most eminent sacrifices for the national cause.²⁴⁵ Of his exegetic method it can only be said, that it is an exaggeration and degeneration of that which prevailed among the Rabbis in general, "it is

²³⁸ Grätz, iv. 175. Derenbourg, p. 436.

²³⁹ See concerning him the Hebrew works of Frankel, Brüll and Weiss; also Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth.* ii. 59 sqq. Landau, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1854, pp. 45–51, 81–93, 130–148. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 53 sqq.; Ewald's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vii. 376 sqq. Derenbourg, pp. 329–331, 395 sqq., 418 sqq. Hamburger, ii. 32–43. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1883, pp. 254 sqq., 297 sqq., 347 sqq., 419 sqq., 433 sqq. Gastfreund, *Biographie des Tanaiten Rabi Akiba* (in Hebrew), Lemberg 1871.

²⁴⁰ Derenbourg, p. 395 sq.

²⁴¹ *Rosh hashana* i. 6.

²⁴² *Sanhedrin* 32b; Derenbourg, pp. 307, 395.

²⁴³ The sentences, *Aboth* iii. 13–16. Among them, iii. 15, is the saying הכל צפוי והרשות נתונה, "Everything is watched (by God), but freedom is granted (to men)."

²⁴⁴ Derenbourg, p. 425 sq.

²⁴⁵ Grätz, iv. 176, 177. Derenbourg, p. 436. Bacher, 1883, p. 256.

the art of deducing heaps of Halachoth from every jot of the law.”²⁴⁶ To attain this, the principle was acted on, that no word of the text was superfluous, that even the slightest, the most apparently superfluous elements of the text contain the most important truths.²⁴⁷ It is of much more value than these exegetical tricks, and of real epoch-making importance in the history of Jewish law, that in the time of Akiba, and probably *under his direction*, the *Halachah*, which had hitherto been only orally propagated, was for the *first time codified*. The various materials were arranged according to the point of view of their actual matter, and what was current law was recorded in writing together with adductions of the divergent views of all the more eminent scribes. This work forms the foundation of the Mishna of R. Judah ha-Nasi, which has been preserved to us.²⁴⁸

R. Tarphon, a priestly scribe, who is said to have been very much in earnest about his priestly duties and privileges, so far as this was possible after the destruction of the temple, was a contemporary of Akiba.²⁴⁹ He lived at Lydda,²⁵⁰ and was chiefly in intercourse with Akiba,²⁵¹ but took part in a

²⁴⁶ Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1883, p. 254 sq.

²⁴⁷ Thus e.g. the particle *אח* is said to indicate, that besides the object mentioned, something else is also intended together with it. In the account of the creation *אח השמים* is used, because the sun, moon and stars are also meant (Wünsche, *Bereshith rabba*, p. 6 sq.). Comp. Derenbourg, p. 397. The proselyte Aquila tried to be faithful to this exegetical principle by translating in his Greek version of the Bible *σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τῇ γῇ*, at which Jerome vents his just scorn (*Epist.* 57 *ad Pammachium*, c. 11, *Opp.* de Vallarsi, i. 316). Comp. also, on Aquila as a disciple of Akiba, Hieronymus, *Comment. in Jes.* viii. 11 sqq. (Vallarsi, iv. 122): Akibas quem magistrum Aquilae proselyti autumant. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 437.

²⁴⁸ That an older work of the time of Akiba is the foundation of our present Mishna, may be inferred almost with certainty from its contents. That the work in question was edited by Akiba himself may also be accepted as probable from the testimony of Epiphanius (*haer.* 33. 9). For further particulars, see § 3. Comp. also Derenbourg, pp. 399–401.

²⁴⁹ See in general, Derenbourg, pp. 376–383. Hamburger, ii. 1196 sq. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1883, pp. 497–507.

²⁵⁰ *Taanith* iii. 9; *Baba mezia* iv. 3.

²⁵¹ *Terumoth* iv. 5, ix. 2; *Nasir* vi. 6; *Bechoroth* iv. 4; *Kerithoth* v. 2–3. *Tosefta*, *Mikwaoth*, 654. 4, 660. 33.

disputation with Eleasar ben Asariah, Ishmael and Joshua.²⁵² Subsequent tradition makes him, like all the scribes of his time, a martyr in the Barkochba war.²⁵³ As this is however of just the same value as the Christian tradition, which makes all the apostles martyrs, he may very well be identical with that Trypho with whom Justin met, and who said of himself that he had fled from Palestine on account of the war.²⁵⁴ It is peculiar that hard words against the Gospels and against the Christian faith should have been reported exactly of him.²⁵⁵

Beside R. Tarphon there remain to be mentioned as contemporaries of R. Akiba, R. Johanan ben Nuri, who lived also in the time of Gamaliel II., Joshua and Elieser, but is most frequently spoken of as in intercourse with Akiba;²⁵⁶ R. Simon ben Asai, or merely Ben Asai, who is famed for

²⁵² *Jadajim* iv. 3.

²⁵³ Grätz, iv. 179. Derenbourg, p. 436.

²⁵⁴ Justin. *Dial. c. Tryphone*, c. 1: εἰσι δὲ Ἰβραῖος ἐκ περιτομῆς, φυγῶν τὸν νῦν γενόμενον πόλεμον, ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι καὶ τῇ Κορίνθῳ τὰ πολλὰ διάγων. The names תרפון and Τρύφων are identical, for it cannot be proved that the former is a genuine Semitic name, although, according to its form, this is possible. The time too exactly agrees. Hence the identity of R. Tarphon with Justin's Trypho has been accepted by many scholars. See Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, ii. 837.

²⁵⁵ He said that the Gospels ought to be burned although they contained the name of God (*Shabbath* 116^a; Derenbourg, p. 379 sq.; Bacher, 1883, p. 506). On account of the great interest of R. Tarphon to Christian theologians, I here give *all the passages of the Mishna in which he is named: Berachoth* i. 3, vi. 8; *Pea* iii. 6; *Kilajim* v. 8; *Terumoth* iv. 5, ix. 2; *Maaseroth* iii. 9; *Maaser sheni* ii. 4, 9; *Shabbath* ii. 2; *Erubin* iv. 4; *Pesachim* x. 6; *Sukka* iii. 4; *Beza* iii. 5; *Taanith* iii. 9; *Jebamoth* xv. 6–7; *Kethuboth* v. 2, vii. 6, ix. 2, 3; *Nedarim* vi. 6; *Nasir* v. 5, vi. 6; *Kiddushin* iii. 13; *Baba kamma* ii. 5; *Baba mezia* ii. 7, iv. 3; *Makkoth* i. 10; *Edujoth* i. 10; *Aboth* ii. 15–16; *Sebachim* x. 8, xi. 7; *Menachoth* xii. 5; *Bechoroth* ii. 6–9, iv. 4; *Kerithoth* v. 2–3; *Kelim* xi. 4, 7, xxv. 7; *Ohaloth* xiii. 3, xvi. 1; *Para* i. 3; *Mikwaoth* x. 5; *Machshirin* v. 4; *Jadajim* iv. 3. For the passages in the Tosefta, see the index to Zuckermann's edition.

²⁵⁶ In the time of Gamaliel, *Rosh hashana* 148. In the time of Joshua, Tosefta, *Taanith* 217. 14. In the time of Elieser, Tosefta, *Orla* 45. 1. *Kelim* 575. 18, 20. In association with Akiba, *Rosh hashana* iv. 5; *Bechoroth* vi. 6; *Temura* i. 1; *Ukzin* iii. 5. Tosefta, *Pesachim* 155. 27. Comp. in general, Hamburger, ii. 490 sq. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1883, p. 537 sq.

being specially indefatigable in study; ²⁵⁷ R. Johanan ben Beroka, who was an associate of Joshua and Johanan ben Nuri; ²⁵⁸ R. Jose the Galilean, who is mentioned as the contemporary of Eleasar ben Asariah, Tarphon and Akiba; ²⁵⁹ R. Simon ben Nannos, or only Ben Nannos, also a contemporary of Tarphon and Akiba. ²⁶⁰

To the same period belongs also Abba Saul, who indeed gives an account even of a saying of Johanan ben Sakkai, and is repeatedly quoted as an authority concerning the arrangements of the temple, but cannot have been of earlier date than Akiba, since he frequently reports his sayings also. ²⁶¹ Also R. Judah ben Betherah, who is mentioned on the one hand as

²⁵⁷ Contemporaries of Akiba, *Shekalim* iv. 6; *Joma* ii. 3; *Taanith* iv. 4; *Baba bathra* ix. 10. It was said of him: "Since the death of Ben Asai there are no longer any indefatigable students" (*Sota* ix. 15: וְשִׁקְרָנִים, properly, waking ones, i.e. untiringly studying ones). Some sentences of his in *Aboth* iv. 2-3. Comp. in general, Hamburger, ii. 1119-1121. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1884, pp. 173-187, 225 sq.

²⁵⁸ With Joshua, Tosefta, *Sota* 307. 7. With Johanan ben Nuri, Tosefta *Terumoth* 38. 15. In the Mishna, Johanan ben Beroka is mentioned, *Erubin* viii. 2, x. 15; *Pesachim* vii. 9; *Jebamoth* vi. 6; *Kethuboth* ii. 1; *Baba kamma* x. 2; *Baba bathra* viii. 5; *Shebuoth* vii. 7; *Aboth* iv. 4; *Bechoroth* viii. 10; *Kelim* xvii. 11. Comp. also Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1884, p. 208 sq.

²⁵⁹ With these three, *Jer. Gittin* ix. 1 (Derenbourg, p. 368). With Akiba and Tarphon, Tosefta, *Mikwaoth* 660. 32. He relates also in the name of Johanan ben Nuri, Tosefta, *Orla* 45. 1. See in general, Hamburger, ii. 499-502. Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1883, pp. 507-513, 529-536.

²⁶⁰ See especially Tosefta, *Mikwaoth* 660. 33. We find him associated with Ishmael, *Baba bathra* x. 8. He is mentioned by his full name Simon ben Nannos (νάννος=dwarf), *Bikkurim* iii. 9; *Shabbath* xvi. 5; *Erubin* ix. 15; *Baba bathra* x. 8; *Menachoth* iv. 3. Only as Ben Nannos, *Kethuboth* x. 5; *Gittin* viii. 10; *Baba bathra* vii. 3, x. 8; *Shabbath* vii. 5.

²⁶¹ On a saying of Johanan ben Sakkai, *Aboth* ii. 8. On the arrangements of the temple, *Middoth* ii. 5; also *Menachoth* viii. 3, xi. 5. On sayings of Akiba, Tosefta, *Kilajim* 79. 9; *Sanhedrin* 433. 27. Comp. also *Pea* viii. 5; *Kilajim* ii. 3; *Shabbath* xxiii. 3; *Shekalim* iv. 2; *Beza* iii. 8; *Kethuboth* vii. 6; *Nedarim* vi. 5; *Gittin* v. 4; *Kiddushin* iv. 2; *Baba mezia* iv. 12, vi. 7; *Baba bathra* ii. 7, 13; *Sanhedrin* x. 1; *Makkoth* ii. 2. Lewy, *Ueber einige Fragmente des Mischna des Abba Saul*, Berlin 1876 (comp. *Magazin für die Wissensch. des Judenth.* iv. 1877, pp. 114-120; *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1878, pp. 187-192, 227-235).

a contemporary of Elieser, on the other as a contemporary of R. Meir, and who must consequently have flourished in the period between the two, *i.e.* in the time of Akiba.²⁶²

R. Judah, R. Joses, R. Meir and R. Simon, men of the next generation, are more frequently mentioned in the Mishna than all those hitherto named. Their labours however, having taken place in the middle of the second century, fall outside the limits of the period here dealt with.

²⁶² Contemporary of Elieser, *Negaim* ix. 3, xi. 7. Contemporary of Meir, *Tosefta*, *Nasir* 290. 14. Comp. also on the chronology, *Pea* iii. 6; *Pesachim* iii. 3; *Edujoth* viii. 3; *Kelim* ii. 4; *Ohaloth* xi. 7. *Tosefta*, *Jebamoth* 255. 28. See in general, Bacher, *Monatsschr.* 1884, pp. 76-81.

A HISTORY
OF
THE JEWISH PEOPLE
IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST

BY THE LATE
PROFESSOR EMIL SCHÜRER, D.D.

AUTHORISED ENGLISH TRANSLATION

COMPLETE IN TWO VOLUMES
EACH COMPRISING ONE DIVISION
(INDEX VOLUME ADDITIONAL)

SECOND DIVISION

(THREE VOLUMES IN ONE)

THE INTERNAL CONDITION OF PALESTINE, AND OF
THE JEWISH PEOPLE, IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST

VOL. II

EDINBURGH : T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH

LONDON : SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED

NEW YORK : CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

<i>Printed</i>	<i>November</i>	1885
<i>Reprinted</i>	<i>July</i>	1890
"	<i>May</i>	1892
"	<i>March</i>	1893
"	<i>March</i>	1898
"	<i>April</i>	1901
"	<i>July</i>	1904
"	<i>July</i>	1906
"	<i>August</i>	1910
"	<i>December</i>	1914
"	<i>July</i>	1922
"	<i>January</i>	1924

CONTENTS OF DIVISION II. VOL. II.



	PAGE
§ 26. PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES,	4
I. The Pharisees,	12
II. The Sadducees,	29
§ 27. SCHOOL AND SYNAGOGUE,	44
I. The School,	46
II. The Synagogue,	52
Organization of the Community, 55. Officers, 62. Buildings,	
68. Order of Divine Worship, 75.	
Appendix.—The Shemah and Shemoneh Esreh, . . .	83
§ 28. LIFE UNDER THE LAW,	90
I. General Observations,	90
II. The Sanctification of the Sabbath,	96
III. Laws concerning Cleanness and Uncleanness, . . .	106
IV. Externalism of Religion,	111
V. Errors,	120
§ 29. THE MESSIANIC HOPE,	126
I. Relation to the older Messianic Hope,	129
II. Historical Survey,	137
III. Systematic Statement,	154
Last Tribulation and Perplexity, 154. Elias as the Fore-	
runner, 156. The Appearing of the Messiah, 158. Last	
Attack of the Hostile Powers, 164. Destruction of the	
Hostile Powers, 165. Renovation of Jerusalem, 168.	
Gathering of the Dispersed, 169. The Kingdom of Glory	
in Palestine, 170. Renovation of the World, 177. The	
General Resurrection, 179. The Last Judgment, Eternal	
Salvation and Condemnation, 181.	
Appendix.—The Suffering Messiah,	184

	PAGE
§ 30. THE ESSENES,	188
I. The Facts,	192
Organization of the Community, 192. Ethics—Manners and Customs, 198. Theology and Philosophy, 202.	
II. Nature and Origin of Essenism,	205
§ 31. JUDAISM IN THE DISPERSION---PROSELYTES,	219
I. Extension, 220. Lands of the Euphrates, 223. Syria and Asia Minor, 225. Egypt, 226. Cyrenaica, 231. Greece and the Islands, 232. Italy, 232.	
II. Constitution of the Communities,	243
1. Internal Organization,	243
2. Political Position,	252
III. Equality in regard to the Rights of Citizenship,	270
IV. Religious Life,	281
V. The Proselytes,	291
Different Kinds, 311. Proselytes of the Gate, 316. Baptism of Proselytes, 319.	

§ 26. PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES.

THE LITERATURE.

For the older literature, see Carpzov, *Apparatus hist.-crit.* pp. 173, 204, and Daniel, art. "Pharisäer," in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopädie*, § 3, vol. xxii. p. 18.

Triglandius, *Trium scriptorum illustrium de tribus Judaeorum sectis syn- tagma, in quo Serarii, Drusii, Scaligeri opuscula quae eo pertinent cum aliis junctim exhibentur.* 2 vols. Delphis 1703.

Ugolini, *Trihaeresium sive dissertatio de tribus sectis Judaeorum (Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum, tom. xxii.; and other dissertations therein).*

Joh. Gottlob Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus antiquitatum sacri codicis* (1748), pp. 173–215.

Grossmann, *De Judaeorum disciplina arcana.* Part i.–ii. Lips. 1833–1834.

The same, *De philosophia Sadducaeorum.* Part i.–iv. Lips. 1836–1838.

The same, *De Pharisaismo Judaeorum Alexandrino.* Part i.–iii. Lips. 1846–1850. The same, *De collegio Pharisaeorum.* Lips. 1851.

Daniel, art. "Pharisäer," in Ersch and Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyklop. der Wissensch. und Künste*, § 3, vol. xxii. (1846) pp. 17–34.

Winer, *Realwörterb.* ii. 244–248 (Pharisäer), and 352–356 (Sadducäer).

Lutterbeck, *Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, i. (1852) pp. 157–222.

Reuss in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. xi. 1859, pp. 496–509 (Pharisäer), and xiii. 1860, pp. 289–297 (Sadducäer).

Müller (Alois), *Pharisäer und Sadducäer oder Judaismus und Mosaismus. Eine historisch-philosophische Untersuchung als Beitrag zur Religions- geschichte Vorderasiens (Report of the Session of the Viennese Academy, phil.-hist. class, vol. xxxiv. 1860, pp. 95–164).*

Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 357 sqq., 476 sqq.

De Wette, *Lehrb. der hebr.-jüdischen Archäologie* (4th ed.), pp. 413–417.

Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 356 sqq., 382 sqq.

Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, i. 197 sqq., 216 sqq.

Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, pp. 101–158. The same, *Sadducäer und Pharisäer (Jud. Zeitschr. vol ii. 1863, pp. 11–54).*

Also printed separately). The same, *Das Judenthum und seine Geschichte*, Part i. (2nd ed. 1865) p. 86 sqq.

Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. iii. (3rd ed. 1878) pp. 91 sqq., 647-657 (note 10).

Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, pp. 75-78, 119-144, 452-456.

Hanne, *Die Pharisäer und Sadducäer als politische Parteien* (*Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1867, pp. 131-179, 239-263).

Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 250-282.

Holtzmann in Weber and Holtzmann, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. 124-135.

Hausrath in *d. Prot. Kirchenzeitung*, 1862, Nr. 44. The same, *Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. i. 117-132. The same in Schenkel's *Bibellexikon*, iv. 518-529.

Ginsburg, arts. "Pharisees" and "Sadducees," in *Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*.

Twisleton, the same article in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*.

Kuenen, *De godsdienst van Israel*, ii. 338-371, 456 sqq. The same, *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1875, pp. 632-650 (advertisement of Wellhausen's work).

Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer. Eine Untersuchung zur inneren jüdischen Geschichte*. Greifswald 1874.

Cohen, *Les Pharisiens*. 2 vols. Paris 1877.

Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*. Leipzig 1880.

Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), § 396, 546, 548-554.

Baneth, *Ueber den Ursprung der Sadokäer und Boethosäer* (*Magazin für die Wissensch. des Judenth.* Jahrg. ix. 1882, pp. 1-37, 61-95. Also separately as a Leipsic doctoral dissertation).

Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. (1883) pp. 1038-1059 (art. "Sadducäer," etc. Comp. also the articles: "Amhaarez," "Chaber," "Chassidim," "Zaddikim").

Montet, *Essai sur les origines des partis saducéen et pharisien et leur histoire jusqu'à la naissance de Jésus-Christ*. Paris 1883 (comp. *Theol. Litztg.* 1883, p. 169).

Sieffert, art. "Sadducäer" and "Pharisäer," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. xiii. 1884, pp. 210-244.

The Testimony of Josephus.

Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 14: Φαρισαῖοι μὲν οἱ δοκοῦντες μετ' ἀκριβείας ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ νόμιμα καὶ τὴν πρώτην ἀπάγοντες αἵρεσιν, εἰμαρμένῃ τε καὶ θεῷ προσάπτουσι πάντα, καὶ τὸ μὲν

πράττειν τὰ δίκαια καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κείσθαι, βοηθεῖν δὲ εἰς ἕκαστον καὶ τὴν εἰμαρμένην ψυχὴν δὲ πᾶσαν μὲν ἄφθαρτον, μεταβαίνειν δὲ εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν μόνην, τὴν δὲ τῶν φαύλων αἰδὶω τιμωρίᾳ κολάζεσθαι. Σαδδουκαῖοι δὲ, τὸ δεύτερον τάγμα, τὴν μὲν εἰμαρμένην παντάπασι ἀναιροῦσι, καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἔξω τοῦ δρᾶν τι κακὸν ἢ ἐφορᾶν τίθενται, φασὶ δὲ ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ἐκλογῇ τό τε καλὸν καὶ τὸ κακὸν προκεῖσθαι, καὶ τὸ κατὰ γνώμην ἐκάστῳ τούτων ἑκατέρῳ προσίεναι. Ψυχῆς δὲ τὴν διαμονὴν καὶ τὰς καθ' Ἑβραίου τιμωρίας καὶ τιμὰς ἀναιροῦσι. Καὶ Φαρισαῖοι μὲν φιλάλληλοί τε καὶ τὴν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ὁμόνοιαν ἀσκοῦντες, Σαδδουκαίων δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους τὸ ἥθος ἀγριώτερον, αἱ τε ἐπιμιξίαι πρὸς τοὺς ὁμοίους ἀπηνεῖς ὡς πρὸς ἄλλοτριους.

Antt. xiii. 5. 9 : Κατὰ δὲ τὸν χρόνον τούτον τρεῖς αἱρέσεις τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἦσαν, αἱ περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων διαφόρως ὑπελάμβανον· ὧν ἡ μὲν Φαρισαίων ἐλέγετο, ἡ δὲ Σαδδουκαίων, ἡ τρίτη δὲ Ἑσσηνῶν. Οἱ μὲν οὖν Φαρισαῖοι τινὰ καὶ οὐ πάντα τῆς εἰμαρμένης εἶναι λέγουσιν ἔργον, τινὰ δ' ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ὑπάρχειν, συμβαίνειν τε καὶ μὴ γίνεσθαι. Τὸ δὲ τῶν Ἑσσηνῶν γένος πάντων τὴν εἰμαρμένην κυρίαν ἀποφαίνεται, καὶ μηδὲν ὃ μὴ κατ' ἐκείνης ψῆφον ἀνθρώποις ἀπαντᾷ. Σαδδουκαῖοι δὲ τὴν μὲν εἰμαρμένην ἀναιροῦσιν, οὐδὲν εἶναι ταύτην ἀξιοῦντες, οὐδὲ κατ' αὐτὴν τὰ ἀνθρώπινα τέλος λαμβάνειν, ἀπαντα δ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς τίθενται, ὡς καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν αἰτίους ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς γινομένους καὶ τὰ χεῖρω παρὰ ἡμετέραν ἀβουλίαν λαμβάνοντας.

Antt. xiii. 10. 5 : [Οἱ Φαρισαῖοι] τοσαύτην ἔχουσι τὴν ἰσχὺν παρὰ τῷ πλήθει ὡς καὶ κατὰ βασιλέως τι λέγοντες καὶ κατ' ἀρχιερέως εὐθὺς πιστεύεσθαι.

Antt. xiii. 10. 6 : Ἄλλως τε καὶ φύσει πρὸς τὰς κολάσεις ἐπιεικῶς ἔχουσιν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι.

Ibid.: Νόμιμα πολλὰ τινὰ παρέδωκαν τῷ δήμῳ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς, ἅπερ οὐκ ἀναγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς Μωϋσέως

νόμοις, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα τὸ Σαδδουκαίων γένος ἐκβάλλει λέγον ἐκεῖνα δεῖν ἡγεῖσθαι νόμιμα τὰ γεγραμμένα, τὰ δ' ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων μὴ τηρεῖν. Καὶ περὶ τούτων ζητήσεις αὐτοῖς καὶ διαφορὰς γενέσθαι συνέβαινε μεγάλας, τῶν μὲν Σαδδουκαίων τοὺς εὐπόρους μόνον πειθόντων, τὸ δὲ δημοτικὸν οὐχ ἐπόμενον αὐτοῖς ἔχόντων, τῶν δὲ Φαρισαίων τὸ πλῆθος σύμμαχον ἔχόντων.

Antt. xvii. 2. 4: Ἦν γὰρ μόριόν τι Ἰουδαϊκῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπ' ἐξακριβώσει μέγα φρονοῦν τοῦ πατρίου νόμου, αὐτοῖς χαίρειν τὸ θεῖον προσποιουμένων, οἷς ὑπήκτο ἡ γυναικωνῆτις· Φαρισαῖοι καλοῦνται, βασιλεύσι δυνάμενοι μάλιστα ἀντιπράσσειν, προμηθεῖς, κάκ τοῦ προύπτου εἰς τὸ πολεμεῖν τε καὶ βλάπτειν ἐπηρμένοι.¹

Antt. xviii. 1, 2: Ἰουδαίους φιλοσοφίαι τρεῖς ἦσαν ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίου τῶν πατρίων, ἥ τε τῶν Ἑσσηνῶν καὶ ἡ τῶν Σαδδουκαίων τρίτην δὲ ἐφιλοσόφουν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι λεγόμενοι. Καὶ τυγχάνει μέντοι περὶ αὐτῶν ἡμῖν εἰρημένα ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ βίβλῳ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου, μνησθήσομαι δὲ ὅμως καὶ νῦν αὐτῶν ἐπ' ὀλίγον.

§ 3: Οἱ τε γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι τὴν δίαιταν ἐξευτελίζουσιν, οὐδὲν εἰς τὸ μαλακώτερον ἐνδιδόντες, ὧν τε ὁ λόγος κρίνας παρέδωκεν ἀγαθῶν, ἔπονται τῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ, περιμάχητον ἡγούμενοι τὴν φυλακὴν ὧν ὑπαγορεύειν ἠθέλησε. Τιμῆς γε τοῖς ἡλικίᾳ προήκουσι παραχωροῦσιν, οὐδὲν ἐπ' ἀντιλέξει τῶν εἰσηγηθέντων ταῦτα θράσει ἐπαιρόμενοι. Πράσσεσθαί τε εἰμαρμένη τὰ πάντα ἀξιούντες, οὐδὲ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου τὸ βουλόμενον τῆς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ὀρμῆς ἀφαιροῦνται, δοκῆσαν τῷ θεῷ κρᾶσιν γενέσθαι καὶ τῷ ἐκείνης βουλευτηρίῳ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸ θελήσαν προσχωρεῖν μετ' ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας. Ἀθάνατόν τε ἰσχὺν ταῖς ψυχαῖς πίστις αὐτοῖς εἶναι, καὶ ὑπὸ χθονὸς δικαιοσύνης τε καὶ

¹ These words of hostility to the Pharisees are evidently not the production of Josephus, but copied by him from Nikolaus Damascenus (comp. Derenbourg, p. 123, note). They are the more valuable as a corrective to the flatteringly coloured representation of Josephus.

τιμὰς αἷς ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας ἐπιτήδευσις ἐν τῷ βίῳ γέγονε, καὶ ταῖς μὲν εἰργμὸν αἰδίου προτίθεσθαι, ταῖς δὲ ῥαστώνην τοῦ ἀναβιοῦν. Καὶ δι' αὐτὰ τοῖς τε δήμοις πιθανώτατοι τυγχάνουσι, καὶ ὅποσα θεῖα εὐχῶν τε ἔχεται καὶ ἱερῶν ποιήσεως ἐξηγήσει τῇ ἐκείνων τυγχάνουσι πρασσόμενα. Εἰς τοσόνδε ἀρετῆς αὐτοῖς αἱ πόλεις ἐμαρτύρησαν ἐπιτηδεύσει τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσι κρείσσονος ἔν τε τῇ διαίτῃ τοῦ βίου καὶ λόγοις.

§ 4: Σαδδουκαίοις δὲ τὰς ψυχὰς ὁ λόγος συναφανίζει τοῖς σώμασι, φυλακῆς δὲ οὐδαμῶν τινῶν μεταποίησις αὐτοῖς ἢ τῶν νόμων πρὸς γὰρ τοὺς διδασκάλους σοφίας ἦν μετίασιν, ἀμφιλογεῖν ἀρετὴν ἀριθμοῦσιν. Εἰς ὀλίγους τε ἄνδρας οὗτος ὁ λόγος ἀφίκετο, τοὺς μέντοι πρῶτους τοῖς ἀξιώμασι, πράσσεται τε ὑπ' αὐτῶν οὐδὲν ὥς εἰπεῖν ὅποτε γὰρ ἐπ' ἀρχὰς παρέλθοιεν, ἀκουσίως μὲν καὶ κατ' ἀνάγκας, προσχωροῦσι δ' οὖν οἷς ὁ Φαρισαῖος λέγει, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἂν ἄλλως ἀνεκτοὺς γενέσθαι τοῖς πλήθεσιν.

Antt. xx. 9. 1: αἵρεσιν δὲ μετῇει τὴν Σαδδουκαίων οἵπερ εἰσὶ περὶ τὰς κρίσεις ὥμοι παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, καθὼς ἤδη δεδηλώκαμεν.

Vita, 2, fin.: ἡρξάμην πολιτεύεσθαι τῇ Φαρισαίων αἵρέσει κατακολουθῶν, ἢ παραπλήσιός ἐστι τῇ παρ' Ἑλλησι Στωικῇ λεγομένῃ.

Vita, 38: τῆς δὲ Φαρισαίων αἵρέσεως, οὐ περὶ τὰ πάτρια νόμιμα δοκοῦσι τῶν ἄλλων ἀκριβεῖα διαφέρειν.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE MISHNA.

(a) *On Perushim and Zaddukim.*

Jadajim iv. 6: "The Zaddukim said to the Perushim: We must blame you, Perushim, for maintaining that the Holy Scriptures defile the hands, while antagonistic books (ספרי המרים or perhaps ספרי המרים=the books of Homer) do not defile the hands. To this Rabban Johanan ben Sakkai replied: Is this then the only thing of the kind, for which the Perushim can be reproached? They also say: The bones of an ass are clean, and

those of the high priest Johanan unclean. To which they replied : Bones are declared unclean according to the proportion of affection, lest perhaps some one should make spoons of the bones of his father or his mother. Hereupon he replied : So too is it with the Holy Scriptures only a proof of affection, when it is declared that they defile the hands, while antagonistic books (the books of Homer) are not loved, and therefore contact with them does not defile."

Ibid. iv. 7 : "The Zaddukim said also : We must blame you, Perushim, for declaring what is poured into an unclean vessel to be clean. The Perushim replied : We must blame you, Zaddukim, for declaring a channel coming out of a burying-place to be clean. The Zaddukim also said : We must blame you, Perushim, for saying : If my ox or my ass does harm, I owe compensation ; and if my man-servant or my maid-servant does harm, I am free. If I must pay compensation for an ox or an ass, to whom I have no legal obligations, why should I not owe compensation for what my man-servant and maid-servant do, to whom I have legal obligations? They replied : That which applies to an ox and an ass, which have no reason, cannot apply to a man-servant or maid-servant, who has reason. For else they might, if I make them angry, set fire to the field of another, and force me to pay expenses."

Ibid. iv. 8 : "A Galilaean heretic² once said : I blame you, Perushim, for writing in a writing of divorcement the name of the governor with that of Moses. The Perushim answered : We must blame thee, Galilaean heretic, for nevertheless writing the name of the governor and the name of God upon one page, and besides this the former above and the latter below. For it is written in the Bible (Ex. v. 2) : *Pharaoh* said : Who is *Jahveh*, that I should obey Him and let Israel go? "

Chagiga ii. 7 : "The garments of Am-haarez are Midras (מדרס, that is, defiled by pressure) for Perushim ; those of the Perushim are Midras for those who eat the heave ; those of the latter are Midras for those who eat holy things ; and those of the latter are Midras for those who sprinkle the water of purification."³

² According to the best authorities (*Cod. de Rossi* 188, Cambridge MS., *editio princeps* of the *Mishna*, 1492), the reading here and further on should be מין גלילי instead of מין גלילי.

³ On the meaning of Am-haarez (עם הארץ), see farther on. "Those who eat the heave" are the priests and those belonging to them, "those who eat the holy things" are the ministering priests. Each subsequent category stands a degree higher in holiness and purity than the preceding one, on which account the garments of the preceding are unclean and unlawful for them ;

Sota iii. 4 : "R. Joshua used to say : A foolish saint, a wise sinner, a *Pharisaic* woman (אִשָּׁה פְּרִיזִיתָא) and the sufferings of Perushim destroy the world."⁴

Erubin vi. 2 : "Rabban Gamaliel relates : A *Zadduki* once lived with us in a *Maboi* (a street fenced off for the purpose of freer Sabbath intercourse) in Jerusalem. Then my father said : Bring quickly all your goods into the *Maboi*, before the *Zadduki* can bring anything there, and make it unlawful for you. R. Judah quotes the saying differently : Do quickly what you have to do in the *Maboi* before the *Zadduki* brings anything there, and makes it unlawful for you."⁵

Makkoth i. 6 : "False witnesses are only to be executed, when sentence has been passed upon one found guilty through them. The *Zaddukim* say : Only when he has been already executed ; because it is said (Deut. xix. 21), life for life. But the learned have refuted this, because it is said (Deut. xix. 19) you shall do to him as he thought to do to his brother. His brother therefore still exists."

In *Para* iii. 3 the ordinary printed text has only צְדֻקִים. Better authorities have מִיָּנִים.⁶

Para iii. 7 : "The priests who burned the red heifer, were purposely declared unclean on account of the *Zaddukim*, that they might not assert, that the heifer was prepared by such only as had become clean through the setting of the sun."

comp. in illustration, Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb. s.v.* מִדְרָם (iii. 33 sq.), and the translation in the *Mishna* published under Jost's direction.

⁴ The meaning seems to be, that the world cannot continue with a combination of irreconcilable contrasts. Expositors indeed explain it differently. See Surenhusius' *Mishna*, iii. 218 sqq.

⁵ The explanation of the difficult *Mishna* is doubtful, and the difficulty is increased by the uncertainty of the reading in the last sentence (see the note in Jost's *Mishna*, and the commentary in Surenhusius, ii. 108 sq.). At all events however Gamaliel means, according to the first reported form of his speech, to say, that his father placed the *Zadduki* on a level with another (rigidly legal) Israelite. For when several Israelites *jointly* deposited anything before the beginning of the Sabbath in a space fenced off, on which their houses abutted, they thereby made this space their private tenement, within which it was lawful even on the Sabbath to carry in and out. Those however who had taken no part in such depositing were excluded from this privilege.

⁶ So *Cod. de Rossi* 138, the Cambridge MS., and the *editio princeps* of the *Mishna* (Naples 1492).

Nidda iv. 2: "The daughters of the Zaddukim are, if they walk in the ways of their fathers, equal to Samaritan women. If they walk openly in the ways of Israel, they are equal to Israelitish women. R. Jose says: They are all looked upon as Israelitish women, unless it is proved that they walk in the ways of their fathers."

(b) *On Chaber and Am-haarez.*

Demai ii. 3: "He who takes upon himself to be a Chaber (חָבֵר) sells neither fresh nor dry fruits to the Am-haarez (עַם הָאֲרָץ), buys from them no fresh, does not enter their houses as a guest, nor receive them as guests within his walls. R. Judah says: He must also breed no small cattle,⁷ not be frivolous in oaths and jokes, not defile himself with the dead, must on the other hand wait in the school-house. He was however answered: All this does not amount to the main thing."

Demai vi. 6: "If a Chaber and an Am-haarez inherit from their father, who was an Am-haarez, the former may say: Do thou take the wheat in this place and I will take the wheat in that place, thou the wine of this, I of that place. But he may not say to him: Do thou take wheat and I barley; thou the moist, I the dry."⁸

Demai vi. 12: "If an Am-haarez says to a Chaber: Buy me a bundle of vegetables, buy me a loaf, the latter may buy without special remark and is free from the duty of tithing. But if he added: I buy this for myself and that for my friend, and they get mixed, he must tithe all, even if the latter were a hundred (i.e. a hundred times as great as his own").

Shebiith v. 9 = *Gittin* v. 9: "One woman may lend to another, who is suspected about shebiith (the eating of the fruits of the seventh year), a flour sieve, a corn sieve, a hand mill and a stove, but may not help her to gather or to grind. The wife of a Chaber may lend the wife of an Am-haarez a flour sieve and a corn sieve, and may also help her to gather, to grind and to winnow. But when once water has been poured on the flour she may no longer handle it with her,⁹ for one must not assist the

⁷ Because shepherds do not spare their neighbour's field.

⁸ This is in the interest of the correct tithing of all the different crops by the Chaber.

⁹ The reason of this is found in the laws concerning clean and unclean. See the commentary.

transgressor. Besides, this latter has been only allowed for the sake of peace, just as one may in the seventh year wish success to the labour of the Gentiles, but not to that of an Israelite, etc."

Bikkurim iii. 12: "R. Judah says: A priest may make a present of the first-fruits only to a Chaber."

Tohoroth vii. 4: "If the wife of a Chaber has left the wife of an Am-haarez grinding at the mill in her house, the house is unclean if the mill stops; but if it goes on grinding, only that is unclean which the woman could reach by stretching out her hand. If there are two such women there, all is, according to R. Meir, unclean, because while the one is grinding, the other can touch everything, but according to the learned, only that which each could touch by stretching out her hand."

Tohoroth viii. 5: "If the wife of an Am-haarez enters the house of a Chaber to fetch out his son, his daughter, or his cattle, the house remains clean, because she has no permission to stay there."

The *priests* and *scribes* were the two influential factors which determined the inner development of Israel after the captivity. In Ezra's time they were still virtually identical. From the commencement of the Greek period they were more and more separated, and about the period of the Maccabæan conflict two parties sharply contrasted with each other were developed from them. The *Sadducean* party proceeded from the ranks of the priests, the party of the *Pharisees* from the scribes. We know these two parties from the testimony especially of the New Testament and Josephus as two circles in hostile opposition to each other. But we shut out beforehand the comprehension of their nature, if we view the contrast between the two as one really the result of opinion. The Pharisees were by nature *the rigidly legal*, the Sadducees in the first instance only the *aristocrats*, who certainly were driven by the historical development into that opposition to Pharisaic legality, which however formed no fundamental element of their nature. Hence we gain but a distorted image by opposing the differences between them to each other point by point. On the contrary, the characteristic feature of the

Pharisees arises from their *legal tendency*, that of the *Sadducees* from their *social position*.¹⁰

I. THE PHARISEES.

The Pharisees were simply those who were specially exact about the interpretation and observance of the law, hence they were the *rigidly legal*, who spared themselves no pains and privations in its punctual fulfilment. "They were considered to interpret the law with accuracy."¹¹ "They valued themselves upon their accurate interpretation of the law of their fathers."¹² "They renounce the enjoyments of life and in nothing surrender themselves to comfort."¹³ Hence they were those, who seriously and consistently strove to carry out in practice the ideal of a legal life set up by the scribes. And this is to say, that they were the *classic representatives of that tendency, which the internal development of Israel altogether adopted during the post-exilian period*. What applies to this in general applies in a specific manner to the Pharisaic party. It was the germ proper, which was distinguished from the rest of the mass only by its greater strictness and consistency. Hence the law, in that maturity of complication which had been given to it by the labours of the scribes during the course of centuries, was the basis of all its efforts. To carry this out in every point was the beginning and end of all its endeavours. Hence all that has been said above (§ 25. III.)

¹⁰ The above expressed thought, that the contrast between the two was not one of opinion, was first precisely formulated by Wellhausen.

¹¹ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14: οἱ δοκῶντες μετ' ἀκριβείας ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ νόμιμα. *Vita*, 38: οἱ περὶ τὰ πάτρια νόμιμα δοκοῦσι τῶν ἄλλων ἀκριβείᾳ διαφέρειν. *Comp. Acts* xxii. 3, xxvi. 5; *Phil.* iii. 5.

¹² *Antt.* xvii. 2. 4: ἐπ' ἐξακριβώσει μέγα φρονοῦν τοῦ πατρίου νόμου.

¹³ *Antt.* xviii. 1. 3: τὴν διαίταν ἐξευτελίζουσιν, οὐδὲν εἰς τὸ μαλακώτερον ἰνδιδόντες.

on the development of Jewish law by the labours of the scribes, and all that will be adduced farther on (§ 28) on the nature of Jewish legalism, serves to characterize Pharisaism. The legalism there described is just the Pharisaic. But as Pharisaism rests upon the foundation of the law as developed by the scribes, so did it also in its turn govern the farther development of Jewish law. When the Pharisaic party had once been formed as such, all the more famous scribes, at least all those who influenced the future development, proceeded from its midst. There were indeed Sadducean scribes. But their work has left no trace behind it in history. All the influential scribes belonged to the Pharisaic party. This may be assumed as self-evident, and is confirmed by the fact, that in the few cases in which the party position of the scribes is named, they are as a rule designated as Pharisees.¹⁴

After what has been said, it is self-evident, that the Pharisees would declare not only the written Torah, but also the "oral law" developed by the scribes as binding. This whole multitude of enactments now passed as the correct exposition and further development of the written Torah. Zeal for the one implied zeal for the other. Hence it is expressly said in Josephus, "*The Pharisees have imposed upon the people many laws taken from the tradition of the fathers (ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς), which are not written in the law of Moses.*"¹⁵ When John Hyrcanus forsook the Pharisees, he abolished the laws which they had introduced *κατὰ τὴν πατρώαν παράδοσιν*, and at the restoration under Alexandra they were re-enacted.¹⁶ In the New Testament also testimony is given to the estimation in which the Pharisees held the *παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων* (Mark vii. 3; Matt. xv. 2). That the same

¹⁴ Antt. xv. 1. 1: Πωλίωv ὁ Φαρισαῖος καὶ Σαμέας ὁ τοῦτου μαθητής. Also Antt. xv. 10. 4. Acts v. 34: τῖς ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ Φαρισαῖος ὀνόματι Γαμαλιήλ. Joseph. Vita, 38: ὁ δὲ Σίμων αὗτος ἦν πόλεως μὲν Ἱεροσολύμων, γένους δὲ σφύδρα λαμπροῦ, τῆς δὲ Φαρισαίων αἰρέσεως.

¹⁵ Antt. xiii. 10. 6.

¹⁶ Antt. xiii. 16. 2.

standpoint with regard to this *παράδοσις* was represented by the entire body of Jewish Rabbinism has already been shown (vol. i. p. 334 sq.). The Halacha or traditional law, as developed and settled by the labours of the scribes, was declared to be as legally binding as the written Torah. R. Eleasar of Modein said: He who interprets Scripture in opposition to tradition (שֶׁלֹא כַהֲלָכָה) has no part in the world to come.¹⁷ Among the reasons for which the tempest of war bursts upon the country, are named among others, "People who interpret Scripture in opposition to tradition" (שֶׁלֹא כַהֲלָכָה).¹⁸ The traditional interpretation and the traditional law are thus declared absolutely binding. And it is consequently but consistent when deviation from these is declared even more culpable than deviation from the written Torah. *It is more culpable to teach contrary to the precepts of the scribes, than contrary to the Torah itself.*¹⁹ If the traditional interpretation is binding, it is in fact this and not the written law which decides in the last instance. Nor is anything else than this established Pharisaic principle of tradition meant by the rhetorical expression of Josephus, that the Pharisees do not allow themselves to oppose the injunctions of those who precede them in age.²⁰ Certainly there is infinitely more insight in these words of Josephus, than in the assertion of Geiger, that Pharisaism is "the principle of progressive development," and that Protestantism is only "the full reflection of Pharisaism."²¹

As in its position towards the law, so too in its *religious and dogmatic views* does Pharisaism simply represent the orthodox standpoint of later Judaism. In this respect the following points are brought forward, some from the New Testament, some from Josephus, as characteristic of the Pharisees in contradistinction to the Sadducees.

¹⁷ *Aboth* iii. 11.

¹⁸ *Aboth* v. 8.

¹⁹ *Sanhedrin* xi. 3.

²⁰ *Antt.* xviii. 1. 3.

²¹ Geiger, *Sadducæer und Phariseer* (separate reprint), p. 35.

1. The Pharisees teach "that every soul is imperishable, but that only those of the righteous pass into another body, while those of the wicked are, on the contrary, punished with eternal torment";²² or, as it is said in another passage, "they hold the belief that an immortal strength belongs to souls, and that there are beneath the earth punishments and rewards for those (souls), who in life devoted themselves to virtue or vileness, and that eternal imprisonment is appointed for the latter, but the possibility of returning to life for the former."²³ The Sadducees, on the other hand, say that there is no resurrection (*μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν*, Matt. xxii. 23; Mark xii. 8; Luke xx. 27; Acts xxiii. 8; comp. iv. 1, 2). "They deny the continuance of the soul and the punishments and rewards of the world below."²⁴ "According to their teaching, souls perish together with bodies."²⁵ What is here represented in a philosophizing style as the doctrine of the Pharisees, is merely the Jewish doctrine of retribution and resurrection, already testified by the Book of Daniel (Dan. xii. 2), by all subsequent Jewish literature, and also by the New Testament, as the common possession of genuine Judaism. The righteous will rise to life eternal in the glory of the Messianic kingdom, but the unrighteous will be punished with eternal torment. Nor is the essence of this faith the mere opinion of a philosophical school with respect to immortality, but that upon which depends the direct religious interest of the personal salvation of each individual. For this appears to be guaranteed only on the assumption of a resurrection of the body. Hence so great weight is laid upon this, that in the Mishna it is even said, that *he who says, that the resurrection of the dead is not to be inferred from the law, has no part in the world to come.*²⁶

²² *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14. That Josephus does not intend by this to ascribe to the Pharisees the doctrine of the *transmigration of souls* is proved by the passage following.

²³ *Antt.* xviii. 1. 3.

²⁵ *Antt.* xviii. 1. 4.

²⁴ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14.

²⁶ *Sanhedrin* x. 1.

The Sadducees, by denying the resurrection and immortality in general, renounced at the same time the entire Messianic hope, at least in that form which later Judaism had given it. And it was they and not the Pharisees who—from the standpoint of later Judaism—represented a sectarian opinion.

2. The Pharisees also taught the existence of angels and spirits, while the Sadducees denied them (Acts xxiii. 8). This statement of the Acts, though not confirmed by other testimony, is nevertheless thoroughly trustworthy, as in entire accordance with the picture which we elsewhere obtain of the two parties. That in this respect also the Pharisees represented the general standpoint of later Judaism needs no proof.

3. Josephus ascribes also to Pharisees and Sadducees different views concerning Divine providence and human freedom. The Pharisees “make everything depend on fate and on God, and teach that the doing of good is indeed chiefly the affair of man, but that fate also co-operates in every transaction.”²⁷ “They assert, that everything is accomplished by fate. They do not however deprive the human will of spontaneity, it having pleased God that there should be a mixture, and that to the will of fate should be added the human will with its virtue or baseness.”²⁸ They say, that “some but not all things are the work of fate; some things depend on the will of man as to whether they are done or not.”²⁹ The Sadducees deny fate entirely, and place God beyond the possibility of doing or providing anything evil. They say, that good and evil are at man’s choice, and the doing of the one or the other at his discretion.³⁰ “They deny

²⁷ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14.

²⁸ *Antt.* xviii. 1. 3. The above translation rests upon the reading *τε θελήσαν* for *τῷ θελήσαντι* adopted by Bekker.

²⁹ *Antt.* xiii. 5. 9.

³⁰ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14. The reading *τὸν θεὸν ἔξω τοῦ δράν τι κακὸν ἢ μὴ δράν* (for *ἢ ἐφορᾶν*) *τίθενται*, still defended by Keim, i. 281, is quite a useless conjecture, which has been again abandoned by modern editors. The word *ἐφορᾶν* is, as Passow’s *Lexicon* already shows, the only technical

fate by asserting that it is nothing, and that human affairs are not brought to pass by its means. They ascribe on the contrary all to us, maintaining, that we are ourselves the cause of our prosperity, and that we also incur misfortune through our own folly.”³¹ At the first glance it seems very strange to meet with such philosophemes among the religious parties of Palestine, and the suspicion arises, that Josephus not only gave a philosophic colouring to religious views, according to his own fancy, but that without further ceremony he imputed philosophic theories to his countrymen; a suspicion which is increased when we also add his statements concerning the *Essenes*, whence results the systematic statement, that the *Essenes* taught an absolute fate, the *Sadducees* utterly denied fate, and the *Pharisees* struck out a middle path between the two. And to strengthen our suspicion still more, Josephus expressly assures us elsewhere, that the *Pharisees* corresponded to the *Stoics*, and the *Essenes* to the *Pythagoreans*.³² In fact the very expression *εἰμαρμένῃ*, which is utterly impossible to any Jewish consciousness, proves that we have at least to deal with a strongly Hellenized colouring of Jewish views. Still it is merely the garment which is borrowed from Greece. The matter itself is genuinely Jewish. For after all, what Josephus says, when once we strip off its Greek form, is nothing more than this, that according to the *Pharisees* *everything* that happens takes place through God’s providence, and that consequently in human actions also, whether good or bad, a co-operation of God is to be admitted. And this is a genuine Old Testament view. For, *on the one hand*, the strict comprehension of the idea of the Divine

expression in the whole Greek language for the divine supervision of the world, and indeed not only in the sense of *inspicere*, but also in that of *prospicere*, *providere*. The Hebrew *נִפְלָא* in the saying of Akiba, quoted farther on, corresponds with it.

³¹ *Antt.* xiii. 5. 9. On *παρά*, c. acc., meaning through, see Passow, ii 669^b, above.

³² *Vita*, 2, *fin.*; *Antt.* xv. 10. 4.

omnipotence leads to a conception of human actions, whether good or bad, as effected by God.³³ On the other hand, the Old Testament lays quite as much emphasis on the moral responsibility of man; he himself incurs guilt and punishment if he acts wrongly, as he also gains merit and reward if he acts rightly. And for later Judaism the moral independence of man was a fundamental thought, a primary assumption of its zeal for the law and its hope for the future.³⁴ Both lines of thought are genuinely Jewish. It is highly probable in itself, that the reflection of the learned and educated was directed towards the antinomy involved in them and sought to find means of reconciling them. Nay, we have distinct testimony that this was the case, that Rabbinical Judaism did in fact make the problem of Divine Providence and human freedom the subject of its thought.³⁵ This is not however to say, that the three possible standpoints, (1) absolute fate, (2) absolute freedom, (3) interposing inspection, were each represented in so systematic a manner as Josephus states by the three parties of Essenes, Sadducees and Pharisees. This systematizing is certainly the weakest point in the representation of Josephus. Still there may be a certain amount of truth in it. It may be, that in the view of the Essenes the Divine, in that of the Sadducees the human factor occupied the foreground. In any case the Pharisees embraced with equal resolution both lines of thought: the Divine omnipotence and providence and

³³ In these words is the Old Testament view comprised in the excellent disquisition of De Visser, *De daemonologie van het Oude Testament* (Utrecht 1880), pp. 5-47. Comp. *Theol. Litztg.* 1881, col. 26.

³⁴ Comp. e.g. *Psalt. Salom.* ix. 7: ὁ θεός, τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν ἐν ἐκλογῇ καὶ ἐξουσίᾳ τῆς ψυχῆς ἡμῶν, τοῦ ποιῆσαι δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀδικίαν ἐν ἔργοις χειρῶν ἡμῶν.

³⁵ See especially, Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, Div. ii. p. 102 sqq. (art. "Bestimmung"). Also Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 111 sqq. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina*, p. 381 sqq. The Apostle Paul is a proof of how much Jewish consciousness was occupied with the problem in question.

human freedom and responsibility. That the one continued to exist beside and notwithstanding the other is emphatically stated in a saying of Akiba: *הַכֹּל צָפוּי וְהַחֵירוּת נְתֻנָּה*, "Every thing is beheld (by God), but freedom is given (to man)." ³⁶ Herein also the Pharisees represent not a sectarian opinion, but the correct standpoint of Judaism.

In politics too the standpoint of the Pharisees was the genuinely Jewish one of looking at political questions not from a political, but from a religious point of view. The Pharisees were by no means a "political" party, at least not directly. Their aim, viz. the strict carrying out of the law, was not political, but religious. So far as no obstruction was cast in the way of this, they could be content with any government. It was only when the secular power prevented the practice of the law in that strict manner which the Pharisees demanded, that they gathered together to oppose it, and then really became in a certain sense a political party, opposing even external resistance to external force. This took place not only at the time of the oppression by Antiochus Epiphanes, but also under the Jewish princes John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannæus, who opposed Pharisaic ordinances from their Sadducean standpoint. On the other hand, the Pharisees had, under Alexander, who left the whole power in their hands, a leading position in the government, which however they used only for the carrying out of their religious demands. To politics as such they were always comparatively indifferent. It must however be admitted, that there were two different *religious* points of view, especially at the time when Israel was under heathen government or under government friendly to the heathen, from which to judge of the political situation, and that according as the one or the other was placed in the foreground, an opposite demeanour would be maintained towards it. The idea of the *Divine*

³⁶ *Aboth* iii. 15. Derenbourg, p. 127, note, refers also to *Sifre*, § 53.

Providence might be made the starting-point. Thence would result the thought, that the sway of the heathen over Israel was the will of God, that it was He who had given to the Gentiles power over His people to punish them for their transgressions, that this government of the Gentiles could last only so long as it was the will of God. Hence first of all this chastisement of God must be willingly submitted to; a heathen and moreover a harsh government must be willingly borne, if only the observance of the law was not thereby prevented. From this standpoint the Pharisees Polio and Sameas, *e.g.*, exhorted their fellow-citizens to submit to the rule of Herod.⁸⁷ In the time also of the great insurrection against the Romans, we see the chief Pharisees, like Simon the son of Gamaliel, at the head of that mediatizing party, who only joined in the insurrection because they were forced to do so, while they were in heart opposed to it.⁸⁸ An entirely different result however was arrived at, when the thought of *Israel's election* was placed in the foreground. Then the rule of the heathen over the people of God would appear as an **abnormity** whose abolition was by all means to be striven for. Israel must acknowledge no other king than God alone, and the ruler of the house of David, whom He anointed. The supremacy of the heathen was illegal and presumptuous. From this standpoint it was questionable, not merely whether obedience and payment of tribute to a heathen power was a duty, but whether it was lawful (Matt. xxii. 17 sqq.; Mark xii. 14 sqq.; Luke xx. 22 sqq.). From this standpoint, as it seems, the majority of the Pharisees refused to take the oath to Herod.⁸⁹ It may be supposed that this was the specially popular standpoint, both with the people and the Pharisees. Indeed it must have been such, since every non-Pharisaic government, even when it did not prevent the practice of the

⁸⁷ *Antt.* xiv. 9. 4, xv. 1. 1.

⁸⁸ Com. on Simon, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 9.

⁸⁹ *Antt.* xv. 10. 4, xvii. 24

law, involved a certain compromise of its free exercise. Hence it was a Pharisee, one Saddukos, who in conjunction with Judas of Galilee founded the revolutionary party of the *Zealots*.⁴⁰ Indifferent then as Pharisaism at first was to politics, the revolutionary current, which in the time of Christ was continually increasing among the Jewish people, must be set to the account of its influence.

The characteristics of Pharisaism hitherto described show no peculiarity by which it may be distinguished from post-exilian Judaism in general. So far as it is only regarded as an intellectual tendency, it is simply identical with that adopted by the Judaism of the post-exilian period, at least in its main branches and classic representatives. Still it formed a *party within the nation, an ecclesiola in ecclesia*. In one of the two passages in which Josephus, or rather his authority Nikolaus Damascenus, speaks of the refusal of the oath by the Pharisees, he designates them as a *μὲν τὸν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου ἀνθρώπου*, and states their number as six thousand.⁴¹ This leads us to infer a definite boundary of their circle. In the New Testament also and in Josephus the Pharisees evidently appear as a decided fraction of the people. In the same sense also must their *name* be explained. It is in Hebrew פְּרִישִׁים,⁴² in Aramaic פְּרִישִׁין, *stat. emphat.* פְּרִישִׁא, whence the Greek Φαρισαῖοι. That this literally means "the separated" is undoubted. The only question can be, to what to refer the term. Are they those who separate themselves from *all uncleanness* and all illegality, or those who separate themselves from *certain persons*? The first is spoken for by the circumstance, that in Rabbinic Hebrew also the substantives פְּרִישָׁה and פְּרִישוּת occur with the meaning "separation," *scil.* from all uncleanness.^{42a} But if only a separation from unclean-

⁴⁰ Antt. xviii. 41; comp. i. 6.

⁴¹ Antt. xvii. 2. 4.

⁴² Jadajim iv. 6-8; Chagiga ii. 7; Sota iii. 4.

^{42a} Sabim v. 1: לאחר פְּרִישָׁתו מִמִּטְמְאִין, "After he was separated from

ness, without any reference to persons, were intended, other positive epithets would have been more obvious (the "clean," the "just," the "pious," or the like). Besides, a separation from uncleanness is at the same time a separation from unclean persons. If then the latter is in any case to be included, it seems obvious to derive the name from that "separation," which took place in the time of Zerubbabel and then again in the time of Ezra, when Israel separated from the heathen dwelling in the land and from their uncleanness (Ezra vi. 21, ix. 1, x. 11; Neh. ix. 2, x. 29). Wellhausen however is in the right when he objects to this, that this separation, to which all Israel then submitted, had about it nothing characteristic of the Pharisees.⁴³ For the Pharisees must have their name from a separation, which the bulk of the nation did *not* undergo with them; in other words, from a *separation made by them, in consequence of their stricter view of the notion of uncleanness, not only from the uncleanness of the heathen, but also from that with which, according to their view, a great portion of the people were affected.* It was in this sense that they were called the separated or the separating, and they might have been so called from either praise or blame. They might so have called themselves, because they kept as far as possible from all uncleanness, and therefore also from contact with unclean persons. Or they might have been so named in a reproachful sense by their adversaries, as "the separatists," who for the sake of their own special cleanness separated themselves from the bulk of the nation.⁴⁴ The latter

what defiled him." *Tohoroth* iv. 12: טהרת פְּרִישוֹת, "The cleanness of the separated life." *Sota* ix. 15: "Since Rabban Gamaliel the elder died, there has been no more טְהוּרָה וּפְרִישוֹת. *Aboth* iii. 13: "R. Akiba said: Vows are a fence for the פְּרִישוֹת" (i.e. they serve for its maintenance and preservation).

⁴³ Wellhausen, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, p. 76 sqq.

⁴⁴ This view, though intermingled with other points of view, is also the prevailing one in the explanations of the Fathers and the Rabbis. See Clem.,

was certainly the original meaning of the name. For it is not probable that they gave it to themselves. Other positive self-designations would have been more obvious to them, and in fact they first appear in history under the name of סִדְרִיָּה (see below). Their adversaries however called them "the separatists." This also explains why the name so seldom occurs in our oldest Rabbinical authority the Mishna; in the chief passage in the mouth of an adversary and only twice

Homil. xi. 28: οἱ εἰσιν ἀφορισμένοι καὶ τὰ νόμιμα ὡς γραμματεῖς τῶν ἄλλων πλείον ἐιδότες. Pseudo-Tertullian, *adv. haer.* c. 1: Pharisaeos, qui additamenta quaedam legis adstruendo a *Judaeis divisi sunt*, unde etiam hoc accipere ipsum quod habent nomen ἁgni fuerunt. Origenes, *Comment. in Matt.* xxiii. 2 (*Opp.* ed. Lommatzsch, iv. 194): Qui autem majus aliquid profitentes *dividunt se ipsos quasi meliores a multis*, secundum hoc Pharisei dicuntur, qui interpretantur divisi et segregati. Phares enim divisio appellatur. Idem, *Comment. in Matt.* xxiii. 23 sqq. (Lommatzsch, iv. 219 sq.): Similiter Pharisei sunt omnes qui justificant semetipsos, et *dividunt se a caeteris dicentes: noli mihi appropriare, quoniam mundus sum*. Interpretantur autem Pharisei, secundum nomen Phares, divisi, qui se ipsos a caeteris dividerunt. Phares, autem dicitur hebraica lingua divisio. Idem, *Comment. in Matt.* xxiii. 29 (Lommatzsch, iv. 233): Recte Pharisei sunt appellati, id est praecisi, qui spiritualia prophetarum a corporali historia praeciderunt. Idem, *Comment. in Joann.* vol. vi. c. 13 (Lommatzsch, i. 210): Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι, ἅτε κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα ὄντες διηρημένοι τινὲς καὶ στασιώδεις. Idem, *Comment. in Joann.* vol. xiii. c. 54, *fin.* (Lommatzsch, ii. 113): Φαρισαίων δὲ τῶν ἀποδιηρημένων καὶ τὴν θεῖαν ἐνότητα ἀπολωλεκότων· Φαρισαῖοι γὰρ ἐρμηνεύονται· οἱ διηρημένοι. Epiphanius, *haer.* 16, 1: Ἐλέγοντο δὲ Φαρισαῖοι διὰ τὸ ἀφορισμένους εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων, διὰ τὴν ἐθελοπερισσοθρησκείαν τὴν παρ' αὐτοῖς νενομισμένην. Φάρης γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Ἑβραϊδα ἐρμηνεύεται ἀφορισμός. Hieronymus, *contra Luciferianos*, c. 23 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ii. 197): Pharisei a *Judaeis divisi* propter quasdam observationes superfluas nomen quoque a dissidio susceperunt (according to Pseudo-Tertullian, *comp.* below, note 89). Idem, *Comment. in Matt.* xxii. 23 (Vallarsi, vii. 1. 177): Pharisei traditionum et observationum, quas illi *δευτερώσεις* vocant, justitiam praeferebant, unde et *divisi* vocabantur a *populo*; Sadducei autem, qui interpretantur justī, et ipsi vendicabant sibi quod non erant. Nathan ben Jehiel declares in the *Aruch*: פֶּרֶשׁ הוּא שְׁפִירָשׁ עֲצֻמוֹ מִכָּל מִזְמָחָה וּמִן מִאֲכָל מָמָה וְעַם הָאָרֶץ שְׂאִינִי מִדְּרֻקָּם בְּמֵאֵל, "A Parush is one who separates himself from all uncleanness, and from unclean food, and from the people of the land, who are not careful what they eat." For further testimony, see Buxtorf, *Lex Chald.* col. 1851 sq.; Drusius, *De tribus sectis Judaeorum*, lib. ii. c. 2; De Wette, *Archäologie* p. 413.

besides.⁴⁵ The last-named fact certainly shows that the Pharisees on their part accepted the party name when once naturalized. And they might well do so, for from their standpoint the "separation" from which they obtained the name was one thoroughly praiseworthy and well-pleasing to God.

If the name Perushim shows that the Pharisees appeared as "separatists" in the eyes of their adversaries, another name shows us their own view of their character and community. They called themselves merely *Chaberim* (חֲבֵרִים), "neighbours," this term being, in the language of the Mishna and of ancient Rabbinical literature in general, exactly identical with that of Perushim. It is self-evident from the matter of the passages given above (vol. ii. p. 8), that a Chaber in them everywhere means one *who strictly observes the law, especially the laws relating to cleanness and uncleanness*. And indeed the term comprises all those who do so, and therefore not merely those who are scholars by profession. For it is not the unlearned,⁴⁶ but as the tenor of the passages shows, the bulk of those in whom no strict observance of the law can be assumed, the "people of the land" (עַם הָאָרֶץ),⁴⁷ who form the

⁴⁵ The chief passage is *Jadaïm* iv. 6-8; the two other passages, *Chagiga* i. 7; *Sota* iii. 4.

⁴⁶ The unlearned is called, in contrast to the learned, הָרִיזֹט, ἰδιώτης, *Rosh hashana* ii. 8. The notion of the Chaber includes both the הָרִיזֹט and the חֲכָם. See Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*, p. 122 sq.

⁴⁷ Am-haarez is the people who dwell in the land, but do not belong to the community of Israel. The expression however is not used as a collective term only, but also to designate an individual, e.g. an Am-haarez (i.e. one of the people of the land). See in general, *Demai* i. 2, 3, ii. 2, 3, iii. 4, vi. 9, 12; *Shebi'ith* v. 9; *Maaser sheni* iii. 3, iv. 6; *Chagiga* ii. 7; *Gittin* v. 9; *Edujoth* i. 14; *Aboth* ii. 5, iii. 10; *Horajoth* iii. 8; *Kinnim* iii. 6; *Tohoroth* iv. 5, vii. 1, 2, 4, 5, viii. 1, 2, 3, 5; *Machshirin* vi. 3; *Tebul jom* iv. 5. Weber, *System*, pp. 42-44. Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien*, p. 527 sq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 54-56 (article "Am-haarez"). The older literature in Jo. Christoph. Wolf, *Curæ philol. in Nov. Test.* on John vii. 49. See the expositors in general on John vii. 49 (Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Wetzstein, Lampe, and others).

contrast. Hence the usage of language of the Middle Ages, according to which a Chaber is a "colleague" of the Rabbis, a scholar, must not be imported into these passages of the Mishna.⁴⁸ On the contrary, Chaber is in the latter any one who strictly observes the law, including the *παράδοσεις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*, and is thus identical with Pharisee.⁴⁹ This

⁴⁸ In this sense *e.g.* it is explained by Maimonides on *Demai* ii. 3: *חבר* נקרא תלמיד חכם וכן יקראו לתלמידי חכמים *חברים*. Elias Levita in the *Tishbi*, *s.v.*, explains *חבר* by *חבר הרב*, "colleague of the Rabbi," *i.e.* one who has indeed received the ordination of scholars, but is not yet a public teacher (see the passage *e.g.* in Ugolini, *Thes.* xxi. 907; Carpzov, *Apparatus*, p. 142). The majority of Christian scholars follow Elias Levita; see the list of them in Ursinus, *Antiquitates Hebraicae*, c. 8 (Ugolini, *Thes.* xxi. 907), and in Carpzov, *Apparatus*, p. 143. I bring forward only the following: Scaliger (*Elenchus trihaeresii Serarii*, c. 10), Buxtorf (*Lex. Chald. s.v.*), Otho (*Lex. Rabbin. s.v.*), Wagenseil (*Sota*, p. 1026 sq.), Vitranga (*De synagoga vetere*, lib. ii. c. 10, p. 571). This explanation however is in opposition to the Mishna and the older Rabbinical literature. Of course *חבר* may here too denote the colleagues (companions) of a scholar or a judge (*e.g.* *Edujoth* v. 7; *Sanhedrin* xi. 2). But where it is merely used as a *terminus technicus*, without statement of any special reference, it differs from *חכם* and *תלמיד חכם*, and denotes a wider circle than these. Comp. *e.g.* *Kiddushin* 33^b (in Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb. s.v.* *חבר*): *אתון חכמי ואנא חבר*, "You are scholars, and I am only a Chaber." *Shabbath* 11^a: *תחת חכם גוי ולא תחת חבר חכם*, "Under a Gentile and not under a Chaber, under a Chaber and not under the pupil of a scholar" (the passage is already quoted in the *Aruch*, *s.v.* *חבר*, in explanation of this term; on its meaning, see Weber, *System*, p. 142). *Bechoroth* 30^b: *הבא לקבל דברי חכמים ואפילו תלמיד חכם צריך לקבל בפני שלש חברות*, "He who will take upon himself the decrees of the association (*chaberuth*) must do so in the presence of three *chaberim*; even if he is the pupil of a scholar, he must do it in the presence of three *chaberim*."

⁴⁹ The identity of *parush* and *chaber* results chiefly from a comparison of *Chagiga* ii. 7 with *Demai* ii. 3 (see the passages above, vol. i. pp. 385, 386). In the first passage Am-haarez and Parush, in the latter Am-haarez and Chaber are contrasted, and that in such wise, that in both passages the Am-haarez is the unclean, by whose garments the Parush and Chaber are respectively defiled. Evidently then the two latter are identical. Rightly therefore does Nathan ben Jehiel give to *פרושים* in the *Aruch* (*s.v.* *פרוש*, and indeed with a citation of the passage *Chagiga* ii. 7) the explanation: *הן החברין האוכלין חוליון*, "They are the *Chaberim* who eat their profane food in cleanness." *במהרה*, Comp. especially the excellent discussion of Guisius on *Demai* ii. 3 (in

gives us however a deeper insight of the self-estimation of Pharisaism. It so far stands on a level with the general Judaism of the post-exilian period, that to it also the population of Palestine is divided into two categories: (1) *The congregation of Israel*, i.e. the Chaberim, for חָבֵר means simply "neighbour," fellow-countryman,⁵⁰ and (2) the people dwelling in the land. In the eyes of Pharisaism however the former term is restricted to the circle of those, who strictly observe the law together with the entire *παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*. All besides are Am-haarez, and therefore do not belong to the true congregation of Israel. Consequently Pharisaism estimates itself as very specially the *ecclesiola in ecclesia*. Only the circle of the Pharisaic association represents the true Israel, who perfectly observe the law and have therefore a claim to the promises.⁵¹

And their demeanour practically agreed with this theoretical estimation. As an Israelite avoided as far as possible all contact with a heathen, lest he should thereby be defiled, so did the Pharisee avoid as far as possible contact with the non-Pharisee, because the latter was to him included in the notion of the unclean Am-haarez. "The garments of the

Surenhusius' *Mishna*, i. 83). Edzardus, *Tractatus Talmudici Avoda Sara caput secundum* (Hamburg 1710), pp. 531-534. Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae* on Matt. iii. 7 (*Opp.* ii. 271^b). Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth.* i. 204. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*, pp. 42-46, 77. Meanings corresponding to the correct one are found in Levy, *Chald. Wörterb.* s.v. חָבֵר. The same, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* s.v. חָבֵר. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 126-129 (article "Chaber").

⁵⁰ חָבֵר may of course have in itself very different meanings. The above however is the only possible one in accordance with the usage of Old Testament language, when it is used in contrast to עַם הָאָרֶץ. חָבֵר is undoubtedly used in this sense in *Chullin* xi. 2, where it stands in contrast with נָכָרִי (a foreigner); also in the passage quoted above (note 48) from *Shabbath* 11^a, where it stands midway between נָכָרִי and תְּלָמִיד הַכֹּהֵן.

⁵¹ The question "who is my neighbour?" (Luke x. 29) was therefore quite seriously intended. To Jewish consciousness it was in fact an important question, who was to be acknowledged as a Chaber.

Am-haarez are unclean for the Perushim.”⁵² “A Chaber does not go as a guest to an Am-haarez nor receive him as a guest within his walls.”⁵³ “If the wife of a Chaber has left the wife of an Am-haarez grinding in her house, the house is unclean if the mill stops; if it goes on grinding, only unclean so far as she can reach by stretching out her hand,” etc.⁵⁴ When then the Gospels relate, that the Pharisees found fault with the free intercourse of Jesus with “publicans and sinners,” and with His entering into their houses (Mark ii. 14-17; Matt. ix. 9-13; Luke v. 27-32), this agrees exactly with the standpoint here described. The Pharisees did in fact “separate” from the people of the land, so far as to avoid close intercourse with them. Hence the name *Perushim* was rightly given them; nay, from their own standpoint they had no reason for rejecting it.

This exclusiveness of Pharisaism certainly justifies the calling it an *αἵρεσις*, ■ sect, as is done both in the New Test. (Acts xv. 5, xxvi. 5) and by Josephus. Nevertheless it remains the fact, that it was the legitimate and classic representative of post-exilian Judaism in general. It did but carry out with relentless energy the consequences of its principle. Those only are the true Israel who observe the law in the strictest manner. Since only the Pharisees did this in the full sense, they only were the true Israel, which was related to the remaining bulk of the people as these were to the heathen.

Not till after these general characteristics of Pharisaism had been discussed could the question concerning its *origin* arise and its *history* be briefly sketched. Viewed according to its essence, it is as old as legal Judaism in general. When once the accurate observance of the ceremonial law is regarded as the true essence of religious conduct, Pharisaism already exists

⁵² *Chagiga* ii. 7.

⁵³ *Demai* ii. 3.

⁵⁴ *Tohoroth* vii. 4. Compare the passages quoted in note 47

in principle. It is another question however when it first appeared as a sect, as a fraction within the Jewish nation. And in this sense it cannot be traced farther back than to the time of the Maccabaeen conflicts. In these the "pious" (οἱ Ἀσιδαιοί, i.e. חסידים), who plainly formed a special fraction within the people, also took part (1 Macc. ii. 42, vii. 12 sqq.). They fought indeed on the side of Judas for the religion of their fathers, but they were not identical with the Maccabaeen party.⁵⁵ They evidently represented, as may be inferred from their name, that strictest party which upheld with special zeal the observance of the law. *Hence they are the same party, whom we again meet with some decades later under the name of Pharisees.* It appears that during the Greek period, when the chief priests and rulers of the people took up an increasingly lax attitude towards the law, they united themselves more closely into an association of such as made a duty of its most punctilious observance. When then the Maccabees raised the standard to fight for the faith of their fathers, these "pious" took part in the conflict, but only as long as the faith and the law were actually contended for. When this was no longer the case, and the object of the contest became more and more the national independence, they seem to have retired. Hence we no longer hear of them under Jonathan and Simon. Not till John Hyrcanus do they again appear, and then under the name of "Pharisees," no longer indeed on the side of the Maccabees, but in hostile opposition to them. The course of affairs had brought it to pass, that the priestly family of the Maccabees should found a political dynasty. The ancient high-priestly family had been supplanted. The Maccabees or Asmonaeans had entered into its political inheritance. But with this, tasks which were essentially political had devolved upon them. The chief

⁵⁵ This has been well pointed out especially by Wellhausen (pp. 78-86), who rightly identifies the Chasidim with the Pharisees.

matter in their eyes was no longer the carrying out of the law, but the maintenance and extension of their political power. The prosecution however of these political objects could not but more and more separate them from their old friends the "Chasidim" or "Perushim." Not that they had apostatized from the law. But a secular policy was in itself scarcely reconcilable with that legal scrupulosity and carefulness which the Pharisees required. It was inevitable, that sooner or later there should be a breach between them and their two opposite pursuits. This breach occurred under John Hyrcanus. At the beginning of his government, he still adhered to the Pharisees, but afterwards renounced them and turned to the Sadducees. The occasion of the breach is related by Josephus in a legendary style.⁵⁶ But the fact itself, that this change took place under Hyrcanus, is thoroughly authentic. And in consequence we henceforth find the Pharisees the opponents of the Asmonaeon priest-princes. They were such not only under John Hyrcanus, but also under Aristobulus I., and especially Alexander Jannaeus. Under the latter, who as a fierce warrior entirely disregarded the interest of religion, it came even to open revolution. For six years Alexander Jannaeus with his mercenary troops was in conflict against the people led by the Pharisees.⁵⁷ And what he at last attained was only the external intimidation, not the real subdual of his opponents. The stress laid upon religious interests by the Pharisees had won the bulk of the nation to their side. Hence it is no cause for surprise, that Alexandra for the sake of being at peace with her people abandoned the power to the Pharisees. Their victory was now complete, the whole conduct of internal affairs was in their hands. All the decrees of the Pharisees done away with by Hyrcanus were reintroduced, and they completely ruled the public life of the

⁵⁶ *Antt.* xiii. 10. 5-6.⁵⁷ *Antt.* xiii. 13. 5.

nation.⁵⁸ And this continued in all essentials even during subsequent ages. Amidst all the changes of government, under Romans and Herodians, the Pharisees maintained their spiritual hegemony. Consistency with principle was on their side. And this consistency procured them the spiritual supremacy. It is true that the Sadducaeian high priests were at the head of the Sanhedrin. But in fact the decisive influence upon public affairs was in the hands, not of the Sadducees, but of the Pharisees. They had the bulk of the nation as their ally,⁵⁹ the women especially were in their hands.⁶⁰ *They had the greatest influence upon the congregations, so that all acts of public worship, prayers and sacrifices were performed according to their injunctions.*⁶¹ Their sway over the masses was so absolute, that they could obtain a hearing, even when they said anything against the king or the high priest,⁶² consequently they were the most capable of counter-acting the designs of the kings.⁶³ *Hence too the Sadducees in their official acts adhered to the demands of the Pharisees, because otherwise the multitude would not have tolerated them.*⁶⁴ This great influence actually exercised by the Pharisees is but the reverse side of the exclusive position which they took up. It was just because their requirements stretched so far, and because they only recognised as true Israelites those who observed them in their full strictness, that they had so imposing an effect upon the multitude, who recognised in these exemplary saints their own ideal and their legitimate leaders.

⁵⁸ Antt. xiii. 16. 2.

⁵⁹ Antt. xiii. 10. 6: τὸ πλῆθος σύμμαχον ἔχοντων.

⁶⁰ Antt. xvii. 2. 4: οἷς ὑπήκτο ἡ γυναικωνίτις.

⁶¹ Antt. xviii. 1. 3: τοῖς δῆμοις πιθανώτατοι τυγχάνουσι κ.τ.λ.

⁶² Antt. xiii. 10. 5.

⁶³ Antt. xvii. 2. 4.

⁶⁴ Antt. xviii. 1. 4.

II. THE SADDUCEES.

The nature of the Sadducees is not as evident as that of the Pharisees. The scanty statements furnished by documents can only with difficulty be brought under a single point of sight. And the reason of this seems to lie in the nature of the case. The Sadducees are no simple and consistent phenomenon like the Pharisees, but so to speak a compound one, which must be apprehended from different points.

The most salient characteristic is that they are *aristocrats*. Josephus repeatedly designates them as such. "They only gain the well-to-do, they have not the people on their side."⁶⁵ "This doctrine has reached *few individuals*, but these are of the *first consideration*."⁶⁶ When Josephus here says, that this doctrine has reached but few, this is quite consistent with his manner of always depicting Pharisaism and Sadduceeism as philosophical tendencies. Taking off this varnish, his actual statement is, that the Sadducees were the aristocrats, the wealthy (εὐποροί), the persons of rank (πρώτοι τοῖς ἀξιώμασιν). And that is to say, that they chiefly belonged to the priesthood. For from the commencement of the Greek, nay from the Persian period, it was the priests who governed the Jewish State, as it was also the priesthood in general that constituted the nobility of the Jewish people.⁶⁷ The New Testament testifies superabundantly and Josephus expressly, that the high-priestly families belonged to the Sadducean party.⁶⁸ Rightly however as this view is for the first time expressly advocated by Geiger, it must not be so

⁶⁵ *Antt.* xiii. 10. 6: τοὺς εὐπόρους μόνον πειθόντων, τὸ δὲ δημοτικὸν οὐχ ἰπόμενον αὐτοῖς ἔχόντων.

⁶⁶ *Antt.* xviii. 1. 4: εἰς ὀλίγους ἀνδρας οὗτος ὁ λόγος ἀφίκετο, τοὺς μέντοι πρώτους τοῖς ἀξιώμασι.

⁶⁷ Joseph. *Vita*, 1.

⁶⁸ Acts v. 17; *Antt.* xx. 9. 1.

understood as to make the Sadducees nothing more than the party of the priests. The contrast of Sadducees and Pharisees is not a contrast of the priestly and the strictly legal party, but of aristocratic priests and strictly legal persons. The Pharisees were by no means in hostile opposition to the priests as such. On the contrary, they interpreted the legal enactments concerning the revenues of the priesthood abundantly in their favour, awarding to them in full measure, pressed down, shaken together and running over, their heave-offerings, tithes, first-born, etc.,⁶⁹ and decidedly acknowledging the greater sanctity and higher rank of the priests in the Theocracy.⁷⁰ On the other hand too, the priests were not all thoroughly hostile to Pharisaism. There were, at least in the last decades before, and the first decades after the destruction of the temple, a large number of priests who themselves belonged to the Rabbinical class.⁷¹ Hence the opponents of the Pharisees were not the priests as such, but only the *aristocratic* priests: those who by their possessions and offices also occupied influential civil positions.

In view of these facts it is an interesting conjecture of Geiger's—which he indeed expresses as a certainty—that

⁶⁹ Comp. in the Mishna the treatises *Demai*, *Terumoth*, *Maaseroth*, *Challa*, *Bikkurim*, *Bechoroth*.

⁷⁰ *Chagiga* ii. 7: The garments of the Perushim are held as Midras (unclean) for those who eat of the heave-offerings (*i.e.* the priests). *Horajoth* iii. 8: כהן קודם ללוי, ללוי לישראל. Precedence was also given to the priests in the reading of the Scriptures in the synagogues.

⁷¹ It was already testified (*Chagiga* ii. 7) of Joses ben Joaser, that he was a חסיד in the priesthood. One Joaser, who was captain of the temple and therefore a priest, belonged to the school of Shammai (*Orla* ii. 12). In Josephus we meet with a ἱερατικῶν γένους, Φαρισαῖος καὶ αὐτός (Joseph. *Vita*, 39). Josephus was himself both priest and Pharisee (*Vita*, i. 2). There is mention moreover (*Edujoth* viii. 2) of a Rabbi Judah ha-Kohen and (*Edujoth* viii. 2; *Aboth* ii. 8) a Rabbi Joses ha-Kohen. Rabbi Chananiah סגן הכהנים (see vol. i. p. 368) and Rabbi Eleasar ben Asariah (see vol. i. p. 372 sq.) are renowned among priestly scribes. Rabbi Ishmael and Rabbi Tarphon are said to have been priests (see vol. i. pp. 373 and 376).

the Sadducees derive their name צדוקים,⁷³ Σαδδουκαῖοι,⁷⁴ from that Zaddok the priest, whose family had exercised the priestly office at Jerusalem since the time of Solomon. At all events it may now be considered as settled, that the name must not, as was formerly often thought, be derived from the adjective צדיק,⁷⁵ but from the proper name צדוק.⁷⁶ For in the first derivation the change from *i* to *u* is inexplicable,⁷⁶ while on the other hand the pronunciation Zadduk (Σαδδούκ, צדוק) is undoubtedly guaranteed by the concurrent testimony of the Septuagint,⁷⁷ of Josephus,⁷⁸ and of a vowel-pointed MS. of the

⁷³ So are they called in the Mishna, *Jadajim* iv. 6-7; *Erubin* vi. 2; *Makkoth* i. 6; *Para* iii. 7; *Nidda* iv. 2. The singular is in *Erubin* vi. 2. צדוקי, which in the *Cod. de Rossi* is pointed קדוקי (Kametz and Pathach being often interchanged in this manuscript; in the other passages the name is not vowelized).

⁷⁴ So in Josephus and the New Testament.

⁷⁵ So already in many of the Fathers, e.g. Epiphanius, *haer.* 14: ἐπονομάζουσι δὲ οὗτοι ἑαυτοὺς Σαδδουκαίους, δῆθεν ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης τῆς ἐπιπλήσεως ὀρωμένης. Σεδέκ γὰρ ἑρμηνεύεται δικαιοσύνη. Hieronymus, *Comm. in Matt.* xxii. 23 (Vallarsi, vii. 1. 177): Sadducaei autem, qui interpretantur justi. In recent times the derivation from צדוק has been again advocated by Derenbourg (*Histoire*, p. 78) and Hamburger (*Enc.* p. 1041).

⁷⁶ That this is the only possible derivation has been most carefully shown by Montet (*Essai sur les origines des partis saducéen et pharisien*, pp. 45-60). Comp. also besides Geiger, Hitzig, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, p. 469. Keim, i. 274 sq. Hanne, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1867, p. 167. Hausrath, *Zeitgesch.* i. 118; *Bibell.* iv. 520. Wellhausen, p. 45 sqq. Kuenen, *De godsdienst van Israël*, ii. 342 sq.; *Theol. Tijdschr.* 1875, p. 639. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr.* 1876, p. 136. Oort, *De naam Sadducéen* (*Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1876, pp. 605-617). Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schrift A. T.'s*, § 396. Sieffert in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. xiii. 230.

⁷⁷ Wieseler indeed feigns an adjective zadduk, for the existence of which however the proof is still due.

⁷⁸ The name Zadok occurs in the O. T., according to the statement of Brecher's *Concordance* (1876), in all 53 times. Among these in ten passages in Ezekiel, Ezra and Nehemiah (Ezek. xl. 46, xliii. 19, xlv. 15, xlviii. 11; Ezra vii. 2; Neh. iii. 4, iii. 29, x. 21, xi. 11, xiii. 13), the LXX. has the form Σαδδούκ, i.e. according to the correct text, which certainly has in some passages to be restored by the revision according to the MSS. of the printed text.

⁷⁹ A Pharisee Σαδδουκος is mentioned *Antt.* xviii. 1. 1. Comp. also

Mishna⁷⁹ for the proper name Zadok. The party name צדוקים is thus related to צדוק as בויתסים to Boethos or אפיקורסים to Epicuros. The further question, from *what* Zadok the Sadducees derive their name is of less certain decision. An apocryphal legend in the *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan* traces it to a supposed disciple of Antigonus von Socho named Zadok.⁸⁰ But the legend is useless notwithstanding the vigorous defence of it by Baneth,⁸¹ (1) because the *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan* cannot, on account of their late origin, be at all regarded as historical authority for our period, (2) because especially what

Αναβίας Σαδδουκί, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 10, 21. 7, where *Σαδδουκί* cannot mean "Sadducee," the person in question being, according to *Vita*, 39, a Pharisee.

⁷⁹ In the *Cod. de Rossi* 138 the name of Rabbi Zadok is indeed only vowelized in a minority of passages; still where this is the case it is almost always צדק (or צדוק, Pathach and Kametz being often interchanged), viz. in the following passages, *Pea* ii. 4; *Terumoth* x. 9; *Shabbath* xxiv. 5; *Pesachim* iii. 6, vii. 2, x. 3.

⁸⁰ *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan*, c. 5: "Antigonus of Socho received the tradition from Simon the Just. He said: Be not like servants, who serve their Lord for the sake of reward, but be like those who do service without regard to recompense, and be always in the fear of God, that your reward may be double in the future. Antigonus of Socho had two disciples, who taught his saying. They delivered it to their pupils, who in their turn delivered it to theirs. Then they stood up and tampered with its meaning and said: What then did our fathers think, when they spoke thus? Is it possible that a workman should work all day and not receive his wages in the evening? If our fathers had known, that there is a future life and a resurrection of the dead, they would not so have spoken. Then they stood up and renounced the Thorah, and a twofold schism proceeding from them branched off: Sadducees and Boethosees, the Sadducees after the name of Zadok, the Boethosees after the name of Boethos." See the passage also in Tailer, *Tractatus de patribus* (London 1654), p. 33. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 105. Herzfeld, iii. 382. Wellhausen, p. 46. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* (1877), p. 126. Baneth, *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, ninth year, 1882, p. 4 (here is found the translation given above). The Boethosees (בויתסים), who are also once mentioned in the Mishna (*Menachoth* x. 3), derived their name from the high-priestly family Boethos in the time of Herod (see vol. i. p. 204). Hence they are in any case related to the Sadducees.

⁸¹ Baneth, *Magazin f. die Wissensch. des Judenth.* ix. 1882, pp. 1-37, 61-95.

is said of the Boethosees is certainly erroneous (see note 80), and (3) because the legend contains no tradition, but only a learned combination: the Sadducees, who denied the immortality of the soul, being said to have embraced this heresy through a misunderstanding of the saying of Antigonus of Socho, that we ought to do good without regard to future reward.⁸² Thus there is left us only the choice of deriving the name of the Sadducees from one Zadok, unknown to us, who in some time equally unknown founded the party of the aristocrats, or of referring it to the priestly race of the Zadokites. The former is possible, and is preferred *e.g.* by Kuenen and Montet,⁸³ but the latter is certainly the more probable.⁸⁴ The posterity of Zadok performed priestly service in the temple from the time of Solomon. After the Deuteronomic reformation, which interdicted all sacrifice out of Jerusalem, the rites there carried on were alone esteemed legitimate. Hence Ezekiel in his ideal picture of the theocracy awards to the "Zadokites" (זָדֹקִים) alone the right of officiating as priests in the temple at Jerusalem (Ezek. xl. 46, xliii. 19, xlv. 15, xlviii. 11). Ezekiel's demand did not indeed entirely prevail on the restoration of worship after the captivity, since some of the other priestly races were also able to maintain their rights.⁸⁵ Still the Zadokites formed the pith and chief element of the priesthood in the post-exilian period. This is seen especially from the circumstance, that the Chronicler in his genealogy traces back the house of Zadok to Eleasar, the elder son of Aaron, thus giving us to

⁸² Comp. Wellhausen, p. 46. The saying of Antigonus of Socho, on which the combination depends, is found *Abot* i. 3. See vol. i. p. 352.

⁸³ Kuenen, *De godsdienst van Israël*, ii. 342 sq.; *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1875, p. 639. Montet, *Essai*, p. 59.

⁸⁴ So think all named in note 75, except Kuenen and Montet.

⁸⁵ This is to be inferred from the fact, that in 1 Chron. x. besides the line of Eleasar (*i.e.* the Zadokites), the line of Ithamar also appears as authorized to fill the priestly service.

understand, that the Zadokites had, if not the only, still the first and nearest claim to the priesthood (1 Chron. v. 30-41). This procedure of the Chronicler at the same time proves, that the name of the ancestor of this race was still vividly remembered in his times, and therefore in the Greek period also. Consequently *a party which attached itself to the aristocratic priests might very well be named the Zadokitian or Sadduceean*. For though the aristocratic priests were but a fraction of the כֹּהֲנֵי צִדְקָה, they were still its authoritative representatives and their tendency the Zadokian.⁸⁶

This distinctive mark of the Sadducees, viz. their aristocratic character, being now settled, the further mark must next be added, that they *acknowledged only the written Thorah as binding, and on the other hand rejected the entire traditionary interpretation and further development of the law during the course of centuries by the scribes*. "The Sadducees say, only what is written is to be esteemed as legal. On the contrary, what has come down from the tradition of the fathers need not be observed."⁸⁷ So far removed were they from the principle of absolute authority as held by the Pharisees, that they thought it, on the contrary, commendable to oppose their teachers.⁸⁸ It is evident, that what was in question was simply a rejection of the παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, and therefore of the entire mass of legal decisions which had been made by the Pharisaic scribes for the completion and application of the written law. The opinion of many Fathers, that the Sadducees acknowledged only the Pentateuch, but rejected the prophets,⁸⁹

⁸⁶ Comp. especially, Wellhausen, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, pp. 47-50. Idem, *Gesch. Israels*, i. 127-130, 230 sq. Also Kuenen, *Zadok en de Zadokieten* (*Theol. Tijdschr.* 1869, pp. 463-509).

⁸⁷ *Antt.* xiii. 10. 6. Comp. xviii. 1. 4.

⁸⁸ *Antt.* xviii. 1. 4.

⁸⁹ Origenes, *Contra Celsum*, i. 49 (*Opp.* ed. Lommatzsch, xviii. 93): οἱ μόνου δὲ Μωσέως παραδεχόμενοι τὰς βίβλους Σαμαρεῖς ἢ Σαδδουκαῖοι. Idem, *Comment. in Matth.* vol. xvii. c. 35 (on Matt. xxii. 29, in Lommatzsch, iv. 166): τοῖς Σαδδουκαίοις μὴ προσιεμένοις ἄλλην γραφὴν ἢ τὴν νομικὴν . . . τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους, ὅτι μὴ προσίεμενοι τὰς εἰς τῷ νόμῳ γραφὰς πλανῶνται.

is not confirmed by documentary authority, and has therefore been given up as erroneous by modern scholars.⁹⁰ Beside these main principles, on which the Sadducees opposed the entire Pharisaic tradition, specific legal differences between Sadducees and Pharisees have but a minor interest. A number of differences of this kind are mentioned in Rabbinical literature.⁹¹ Some of these notices cannot however be esteemed as historical tradition, especially the statements of the very late commentary on *Megilloth Taanith*. So far as they are trustworthy, they are so isolated and unconnected that no unifying principle can be perceived in them, and certainly not that discovered by Geiger, viz. an advocacy of priestly interests by the Sadducees.⁹² In *penal legislation* the Sadducees were,

Ibid. vol. xvii. c. 36 (on Matt. xxii. 31, 32, in Lommatzsch, iv. 169): καὶ εἰς τοῦτο δὲ φήσομεν, ὅτι μύρια δυνάμενος περὶ τοῦ ὑπάρχειν τὴν μέλλουσαν ζωὴν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις παραθέσθαι ἀπὸ προφητῶν ὁ Σωτὴρ, τοῦτο οὐ πεποίηκεν διὰ τὸ τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους μόνην προσέσθαι τὴν Μωσείας γραφὴν, ἀφ' ἧς ἐβουλήθη πῦτους συλλογισμῷ δυσωπῆσαι. Hieronymus, *Comment. in Matth.* xxii. 31, 32 (Vallarsi, vii. 1. 179): Hi quinque tantum libros Moysis recipiebant, prophetarum vaticinia respuentes. Stultum ergo erat inde proferre testimonia, cujus auctoritatem non sequebantur. *Philosophumena*, ix. 29: προφῆταις δὲ οὐ προσέχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἑτέροις τισὶ σοφοῖς, πλὴν μόνῃ τῇ διὰ Μωσέως νόμῳ, μεδὲν ἑρμηνεύοντες. Pseudo-Tertullian, *adv. haer.* c. 1: Taceo enim Judaismi haereticos, Dositheum inquam Samaritanum, qui primus ausus est prophetas quasi non in spiritu sancto locutos repudiare, taceo Sadduceeos, qui ex hujus erroris radice surgentes ausi sunt ad hanc haeresim etiam resurrectionem carnis negare. With this corresponds almost verbally Hieronymus, *contra Luciferanos*, c. 23 (Vallarsi, ii. 197): Taceo de Judaismi haereticis, qui ante adventum Christi legem traditam dissiparunt: quod Dosithaeus Samaritanorum princeps prophetas repudiavit: quod Sadduceaei ex illius radice nascentes etiam resurrectionem carnis negaverunt.

⁹⁰ It is still defended e.g. by Serarius, *Trihaeresium*, lib. ii. c. 21. Against him, see Scaliger, *Elenchus trihaeresii Serarii*, c. 16; Drusius, *De tribus sectis Judaeorum*, lib. iii. c. 9. Further literature in Carpzov, *Apparatus*, p. 208 sq. Winer *RWB.* ii. 353 sq.

⁹¹ Comp. Herzfeld, iii. 385 sqq. Jost, i. 216–226. Grätz, 3rd ed. iii. 652 sqq., note 10. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 134 sqq. *Sadducäer und Phariseer*, pp. 13–25. Derenbourg, p. 135 sqq. Kuenen, *De godsdienst van Israël*, ii. 456 sqq. Wellhausen, pp. 56–75. Hamburger, ii. 1047 sqq. Montet, p. 236 sqq.

⁹² Against Geiger, see especially Wellhausen, as above.

according to Josephus, the more, and the Pharisees the less severe.⁹³ This may be connected with the fact that the former strictly adhered to the letter of the law, while the latter sought to mitigate its severity by interpretation. In one point mentioned in the Mishna the Sadducees even went beyond the demands of the law. They required compensation, not only if an ox or an ass (Ex. xxi. 32, 35 sq.), but also if a man-servant or a maid-servant had injured any one.⁹⁴ On the other hand, they insisted that false witnesses should be put to death, only when the accused had already been executed in consequence of their false witness (Deut. xix. 19-21), while the Pharisees required that this should take place so soon as sentence had been passed.⁹⁵ Thus in this instance the latter were the more severe. These differences were evidently not differences of principle. The same is the case in *questions of ritual*. For here too a difference of principle can only so far be spoken of, that the Sadducees did not regard as binding Pharisaic decrees with respect *e.g.* to clean and unclean. They derided their Pharisaic opponents on account of the oddities and inconsistencies into which their laws of cleanness brought them.⁹⁶ On the other hand, the Pharisees pronounced all Sadducees unclean, "if they walk in the ways of their fathers."⁹⁷ How far however the Sadducees were from renouncing the principle of Levitical uncleanness in itself,

⁹³ *Antt.* xx. 9. 1: Σαδδουκαίων, οἵπερ εἰσι περὶ τὰς κρίσεις ὡμοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους. *Antt.* xiii. 10. 6: "Ἄλλως τε καὶ φύσει πρὸς τὰς κολάσεις ἐπιεικῶς ἔχουσιν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι.

⁹⁴ *Jadajim* iv. 7^b. For the wording of these and the following passages, see above, p. 384 sqq.

⁹⁵ *Makkoth* i. 6.

⁹⁶ The attacks of the Sadducees upon the Pharisees, mentioned *Jadajim* iv. 6 and 7^a, can only be meant in derision. For the Sadducees would certainly not have gone in for "antagonistic books" defiling the hands (*Jadajim* iv. 6), or for declaring that the "stream" which flows in pouring from a clean vessel into an unclean is clean (*Jadajim* iv. 7^a). They are only deriding the Pharisees for their peculiarities.

⁹⁷ *Nidda* iv. 2.

appears from the fact of their demanding even a higher degree of cleanness for the priests who burnt the red heifer, than the Pharisees did.⁹⁸ This last is at the same time the only point in which a certain amount of priestly interest, *i.e.* of interest in priestly cleanness, is perceived. With respect to the festival laws it is mentioned that the "Boethosees" (who must be regarded as a variety of the Sadducees) maintained that the sheaf of first-fruits at the Passover was not to be offered on the second day of the feast, but on the day after the Sabbath in the week of the festival,⁹⁹ and that consequently the feast of Pentecost, seven weeks later (Lev. xxiii. 15), was always to be kept on the day after the Sabbath.¹⁰⁰ This difference is however so purely technical, that it merely gives expression to the exegetic view of the Sadducees, who did not acknowledge tradition. It certainly never had any practical importance.¹⁰¹ The only difference of importance in the law of festivals, and especially in the interpretation of the law of the Sabbath, is that the Sadducees did not acknowledge as binding the confused mass of Pharisaic enactments.¹⁰² The

⁹⁸ Para iii. 7.

⁹⁹ *Menachoth* x. 3. That is to say, that they understood by the שבת, Lev. xxiii. 11, not the first day of the feast, but the weekly Sabbath. The traditional interpretation, which understands by it the first day of the feast, and therefore by "the day after the Sabbath" the second day of the feast, is the correct one. See Wellhausen, pp. 59 sq., 67. Adler, *Pharisäismus und Sadducäismus und ihre differirende Auslegung des ממוחרת השבת* (*Monats-schr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1878, pp. 522 sqq., 568 sqq., 1879, p. 29 sqq.).

¹⁰⁰ *Chagiga* ii. 4. Those who say עצרת אחר השבת (Pentecost falls on the day after the Sabbath) are indeed here spoken of only in general. But that the Sadducees (Boethosees) are intended must certainly be admitted, according to *Menachoth* x. 3.

¹⁰¹ Comp. Wellhausen, p. 59 sq.

¹⁰² It might indeed be thought, from *Erubin* vi. 2, that the Sadducees also observed Pharisaic subtleties with respect to the Sabbath. For the case is there assumed as possible, of a Sadducee depositing something, in a manner quite Pharisaic, in an artificially fenced off space for the purpose of securing to himself the right of freer movement therein on the Sabbath day. In truth, however, the connection shows that the Sadducees were

difference in principle then between the two parties *is confined on the whole to this general rejection of Pharisaic tradition by the Sadducees*. All other differences were such as would necessarily result, if the one did not acknowledge the obligation of the other's exegetical tradition. Nor must it be thought, that the Sadducees rejected Pharisaic tradition according to its entire *tenor*. Quite apart from the fact, that since the time of Alexandra they had no longer carried out their views into practice, they also theoretically agreed with Pharisaic tradition in some, perhaps in many particulars. They only denied its *obligation*, and reserved the right of private opinion.

In this rejection of the legal tradition of the Pharisees, the Sadducees represented *the older standpoint*. They stopped at the written law. For them the whole subsequent development was without binding power. They also represented a like, one might say archaic, standpoint by their *religious views*, the chief of which have already been spoken of (vol. ii. p. 12 sqq.) —(1) they refused to believe in a resurrection of the body, and retribution in a future life, nay in any personal continuity of the individual; (2) they denied angels and spirits; (3) lastly, they maintained, "that good and evil are at the choice of man, who can do the one or the other at his discretion," and consequently, that God exercises no influence upon human actions, and that man is therefore himself the cause of his own prosperity and adversity.¹⁰⁸ With regard to the two first points, the Sadducees undoubtedly represented the original standpoint of

among those who did not observe the "law of *Erub*." The purpose of a Sadducee in such an action could only have been to annoy his Pharisaic neighbour, who was thus deprived of the space so occupied by the Sadducee.

¹⁰⁸ Halévy, *Traces d'aggadot saducéennes dans le Talmud* (*Revue des études juives*, vol. viii. 1884, pp. 38–56), tries to point out traces of these Sadducaean views even in the Talmud. They are, however, very indistinct.

the Old Testament, in distinction from the later Jewish. For with the exception of the Book of Daniel the Old Testament also knows of no resurrection of the body, and no retribution in another world in the sense of later Judaism, that is to say, no personal salvation of the individual after this earthly life, nor any punishment in the world to come for the sins of this life, but only a shadowy continued existence in Sheol. So too is the belief in angels and demons, in the development which it subsequently attained, still foreign to the Old Testament. The Sadducees then in both these respects remained essentially at the more ancient standpoint. Only we must not indeed say, that their special motive was the conservative feature, the cleaving to the old as such. On the contrary, it is evident that a certain amount of *worldliness* was the result of the superior political position of the Sadducees. Their interests were entirely in this world, and they had no such intensively religious interest as the Pharisees. Hence it was their slighter amount of religious energy which made the older standpoint seem sufficient for them. Nay, it is probable that in their case, as men of rank and culture, *illuministic motives* also intervened. The more fantastically the imaginary religious sphere of Judaism was fashioned, the less were they able to follow the course of its development. It is from this point of view indeed that the stress laid by the Sadducees on human freedom is chiefly to be explained. If the statements of Josephus on this point are on the whole worthy of credence, we can only perceive in this stronger insistence upon liberty also, a recession of the religious motive. They insisted that man was placed at his own disposal, and rejected the thought that ■ divine co-operation takes place in human actions as such.

The last-named particulars also show in part, how it was just the high aristocracy that acceded to the tendency designated as "Sadducean." In order to understand the genesis of this

tendency, we must start from the fact, that the whole conduct of political affairs was already in the Persian, but especially in the Greek period, in the hands of the priestly aristocracy. The high priest was chief of the State, eminent priests undoubtedly stood at the head of the Gerusia (the Sanhedrim of the day). The duties of the priestly aristocracy were therefore quite as much political as religious. This necessarily involved a very real regard to political interests and points of view in all their proceedings. But the more decidedly these came to the foreground, the more did those of religion recede. This seems to have been especially the case in the Greek period, and indeed for this reason, that political interests were now combined with *Greek culture*. They who then wanted to effect anything in the political world must of necessity stand on a more or less friendly footing with Hellenism. Thus Hellenism gained ground more and more in the higher ranks of the priesthood at Jerusalem, which was in the same proportion alienated from the Jewish religious interest. Hence it is comprehensible, that it was just in these circles that Antiochus Epiphanes most easily found an admission of his demands. A portion of the priests of rank were even ready without further ceremony to exchange Jewish for heathen rites. This triumph of heathenism was not indeed of long continuance, the Maccabaeen rising putting a speedy end to it. Still the tendencies of the priestly aristocracy remained essentially the same. Though there was no longer any talk of heathen rites, though the special friends of the Greeks were either expelled or silenced, there was still among the priestly aristocracy the same worldly-mindedness and the same at least comparative laxity of interest in religion. On the other hand, however, a revival and strengthening of religious life was the result of the Maccabaeen rising. The rigidly legal party of the "Chasidees" gained more and more influence. And therewith their pretensions also increased.

Those only were to be acknowledged as true Israelites who observed the law according to the full strictness of the interpretation given to it by the scribes. But the more strenuously this demand was made, the more decided was the recusancy of the aristocrats. It seems as though it were just the religious revival of the Maccabaeian period which led to a firmer consolidation of parties. The "Chasidees" were consistent with their principles, and became "*Pharisees*." *The high aristocracy rejected the results that had been reached during the last few centuries in both the interpretation of the law and the development of religious views.* They saw in the *παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων* an excess of legal strictness which they refused to have imposed upon them, while the advanced religious views were, on the one hand, superfluous to their worldly-mindedness, and on the other, inadmissible by their higher culture and enlightenment. The heads of this party belonging to the ancient priestly race of the Zadokites, they and their followers were called Zadokites or Sadducees by their opponents.

Under the earlier Maccabees (Judas, Jonathan, and Simon) this "Zadokite" aristocracy was necessarily in the background. The ancient high-priestly family which, at least in some of its members, represented the extreme philo-Hellenistic standpoint, was supplanted. The high-priestly office remained for a time unoccupied. In the year 152, Jonathan was appointed high priest, and thus was founded the new high-priestly dynasty of the Asmonaeans, whose whole past compelled them at first to support the rigidly legal party. Nevertheless there was not in the times of the first Asmonaeans (Jonathan, Simon) an entire withdrawal of the Sadducees from the scene. The old aristocracy was indeed purged from its more extreme philo-Grecian elements, but did not therefore at once wholly disappear. The Asmonaeian parvenus had to come to some kind of understanding with it, and to yield to it at least a

portion of seats in the "Gerusia." Things remained in this position till the time of John Hyrcanus, when the Sadducees again became the really ruling party, John Hyrcanus, Aristobulus I., and Alexander Jannaeus becoming their followers. The reaction under Alexandra brought the Pharisees back to power. Their *political* supremacy was however of no long duration. Greatly as the spiritual power of the Pharisees had increased, the Sadducean aristocracy were able to keep at the helm in politics, and that notwithstanding the overthrow of the Asmonaeans and Herod's proscriptions of the ancient nobility who had leagued with them. The high-priestly families of the Herodian-Roman period belonged also to the Sadducean party. This is decidedly testified for at least the Roman period.¹⁰⁴ The price at which the Sadducees had to secure themselves power at this later period was indeed a high one, for they were obliged in their official actions actually to accommodate themselves to Pharisaic views. "Nothing is, so to speak, done by them, for whenever they obtain office they adhere, though unwillingly and by constraint, to what the Pharisees say, as otherwise the multitude would not tolerate them."¹⁰⁵

With the fall of the Jewish State the Sadducees altogether disappear from history. Their strong point was politics. When deprived of this their last hour had struck. While the Pharisaic party only gained more strength, only obtained more absolute rule over the Jewish people in consequence of the collapse of political affairs, the very ground on which they

¹⁰⁴ Acts v. 17. Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 9. 1.

¹⁰⁵ *Antt.* xviii. 1. 4. It is a complete misunderstanding to read from these words that the Sadducees only took office unwillingly (so even Winer, *RWB.* p. 356). On the contrary, they eagerly strove for it. The words *ἀκονοίας μὲν καὶ κατ' ἀνάγκην* are, as the *μὲν* and *καὶ* prove, to be combined with those which follow. Comp. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 108, note. The same, *Sadducäer und Phariseer*, p. 13. Hanne, *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* Keim, i. 282, note. Wellhausen, p. 45.

stood was cut away from the Sadducees. Hence it is not to be wondered, that Jewish scholars soon no longer even knew who the Sadducees really were. In the Mishna we still find some trustworthy traditions concerning them; but the Talmudic period, properly so called, has but a very misty notion of them.

§ 27. SCHOOL AND SYNAGOGUE.

"THE people which knoweth not the law is accursed" (John vii. 49). Such was the fundamental conviction of post-exilic Judaism. And this of itself implies that a knowledge of the law was esteemed as the possession worthy above all others to be striven after. Hence the exhortation: To the law! is sounded abroad in every key. Joses ben Jozer said: Let your house be a house of assembly for those wise in the law (חֲכָמִים); let yourself be dusted by the dust of their feet, and drink eagerly their teaching.¹ Joshua ben Perachiah said: Get thyself a teacher (רֵב).² Shammai said: Make the study of the law thy special business (עֲבֹד).³ Rabban Gamaliel said: Appoint for thyself a teacher, so wilt thou avoid what is doubtful.⁴ Hillel said: An ignorant man cannot be truly pious (לֹא עִם הָאֶרֶץ חָסִיד).⁵ He also said: The more teaching of the law, the more life; the more school, the more wisdom; the more counsel, the more reasonable action. He who gains a knowledge of the law gains life in the world to come.⁶ R. Joses ha-Kohen said: Give thyself the trouble to learn the law, for it is not obtained by inheritance.⁷ R. Eleazar ben Arach said: Be diligent in the study of the law.⁸ R. Chananiah ben Teradion said: When two sit together and do not converse about the law, they are an assembly of scorners, of which it is said: sit not in the seat of scorners. When however two sit together and converse about the law, the Shechinah is present among them.⁹ R. Simon said: When three eat together at one table

¹ *Aboth* i. 4.

⁴ *Aboth* i. 16.

⁷ *Aboth* ii. 12.

² *Aboth* i. 6.

⁵ *Aboth* ii. 5.

⁸ *Aboth* ii. 14.

³ *Aboth* i. 15.

⁶ *Aboth* ii. 7.

⁹ *Aboth* iii. 2; comp. iii. 6.

and do not converse about the law, it is as though they ate of the offerings of the dead. But when three eat together at one table and converse about the law, it is as though they ate at the table of God.¹⁰ R. Simon said: He who in walking repeats the law to himself, but interrupts himself and exclaims, How beautiful is this tree! How beautiful is this field! the Scripture will impute it to him as though he had forfeited his life.¹¹ R. Nehorai said: Always travel towards a place where there is instruction in the law, and say not that it will come after thee, or that thy companions will preserve it for thee; also depend not upon thine own acuteness.¹² The same R. Nehorai said: I lay aside all the trade of the world, and teach my son only the law, for its reward is enjoyed in this world, and the capital (הֶקֶר) remains for the world to come.¹³ The following things have no measure: the Peah, the first-fruits, pilgrimage, benevolence, the study of the law. The following are things whose interest (פִּירוֹת) is enjoyed in this world, while the capital (הֶקֶר) remains for the world to come: reverence for fathers and mothers, benevolence, peace-making among neighbours, and *the study of the law above them all*.¹⁴ A bastard who knows the law takes precedence of a high priest if he is ignorant.¹⁵

Such an estimation of the law would necessarily impel to the employment of every possible means for bestowing upon the whole people the benefit of the most thorough knowledge and practice of the law. What the Pharisaic scribes had established in their schools as the law of Israel, was to become both in theory and practice the common possession of the whole nation. For both the *knowledge* and *practice* of

¹⁰ *Aboth* iii. 2.¹¹ *Aboth* iii. 7.¹² *Aboth* iv. 14.¹³ *Kiddushin* iv. 14.¹⁴ *Peah* i. 1.¹⁵ *Horajoth* iii. 8. Comp. on the necessity and value of the study of the law, Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie* (1880), pp. 28-31.

the law were required. Josephus boasts of it as an excellence of the Israelitish nation, that in their case neither one nor the other received a one-sided preference, as in the case of the Spartans, who educated by custom, not by instruction (*ἔθουσιν ἐπαίδευον, οὐ λόγους*), and, on the other hand, of the Athenians and other Greeks, who contented themselves with theoretic instruction, and neglected practice. "But our lawgiver very carefully combined the two. For he neither left the practice of morals silent, nor the teaching of the law unperformed."¹⁶ The instruction which formed the prerequisite of practice began in early youth, and continued during the whole life of the Israelite. The care of its foundation rested with the *school* and *family*, that of its farther carrying on with the *synagogue*.

I. THE SCHOOL.

THE LITERATURE.

Ursinus, *Antiquitates Hebraicae Scholastico-Academicae*, Hafniae 1702 (also in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxi.).

Pacht, *De eruditione Judaica (dissertatio, quam praeside A. G. Waehnero examini submittet auctor J. L. Pacht)*, Gotting. 1742. It specially treats, pp. 50-55: de ludis puerorum.

Andr. Georg Waehner, *Antiquitates Ebraeorum*, vol. ii. (Gottingae 1742), pp. 788-804: de eruditione Ebraeorum.

Ant. Theod. Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung des A. T. mit dem Neuen* (1831), pp. 377-384.

Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i. 186-192.

Winer, *RWB.*, arts. "Kinder" and "Unterricht." Still more literature is here given.

Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 248, 266-268.

Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, i. 424 sqq.

Diestel, art. "Erziehung," in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* ii. 172 sq.

¹⁶ *Contra Apion.* ii. 16-17.

- Ginsburg, art. "Education," in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*.
 S. R. Hirsch, *Aus dem rabbinischen Schulleben*. Frankf. a. M. 1871 (Progr.).
 Elias van Gelder, *Die Volksschule des jüdischen Alterthums nach talmudischen und rabbinischen Quellen*. Berl. 1872 (Leipziger Dissertat.).
 Leop. Löw, *Die Lebensalter in der jüdischen Literatur* (Szegedin 1875), pp. 195 sqq., 407 sqq.
 Mos. Jacobson, *Versuch einer Psychologie des Talmud* (Hamburg 1878), pp. 93-101.
 Jos. Simon, *L'éducation et l'instruction des enfants chez les anciens Juifs d'après la Bible et le Talmud*, 3rd ed. Leipzig 1879, O. Schulze.
 Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. i. art. "Erziehung," Div. ii. arts. "Lehrer," "Mizwa," "Schule," "Schüler," "Unterricht."

According to the statement of Josephus, Moses had already prescribed "that boys should learn the most important laws, because this is the best knowledge and the cause of prosperity."¹⁷ "He commanded to instruct children in the elements of knowledge (reading and writing), to teach them to walk according to the laws, and to know the deeds of their forefathers. The latter, that they might imitate them; the former, that growing up with the laws they might not transgress them, nor have the excuse of ignorance."¹⁸ Josephus repeatedly commends the zeal with which the instruction of the young was carried on. "We take most pains of all with the instruction of children, and esteem the observation of the laws and the piety corresponding with them the most important affair of our whole life."¹⁹ "If any one should question one of us concerning the laws, he would more easily repeat

¹⁷ *Antt.* iv. 8. 12: Μανθανέντων δὲ καὶ οἱ παῖδες πρώτους τούτων νόμους μάθημα κάλλιστον καὶ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας αἴτιον.

¹⁸ *Apion.* ii. 25: Καὶ γράμματα παιδεύειν ἐκέλευσε [*scil.* τοὺς παῖδας], περί τε τούτων νόμους ἀναστρέφεσθαι καὶ τῶν προγόνων τὰς πράξεις ἐπίστασθαι, τὰς μὲν ἵνα μιμῶνται, τοῖς δ' ἵνα συντρεφόμενοι μὴτε παραβαίνωσι μὴτε σκῆψιν ἀγνοίας ἔχωσι. On γράμματα = the elements of knowledge (reading and writing), see Passow's *WB.* s.v.

¹⁹ *Apion.* i. 12: Μάλιστα δὲ πάντων περὶ παιδοτροφίαν φιλοκαλοῦντες, καὶ τὸ φυλάττειν τούτων νόμους καὶ τὴν κατὰ τούτους παραδεδομένην εὐσεβείαν ἔργον ἀναγκαιότατον πάντος τοῦ βίου πεποιημένοι.

all than his own name. Since we learn them *from our first consciousness*, we have them, as it were, engraven on our souls; and a transgression is rare, but the averting of punishment impossible.”²⁰ In like manner does Philo express himself: “Since the Jews esteem their laws as divine revelations, and are instructed in the knowledge of them from their *earliest youth*, they bear the image of the law in their souls.”²¹ “They are taught, so to speak, from their *swaddling-clothes* by their parents, teachers, and those who bring them up, even before instruction in the sacred laws and the unwritten customs, to believe in God the one Father and Creator of the world.”²² Josephus boasts of himself, that in his fourteenth year he had already so accurate an acquaintance with the law, that the high priest and chief men of Jerusalem used to come to him to learn particulars respecting the law.²³ In view of all this testimony it cannot be doubted, that in the circles of genuine Judaism boys were from their tenderest childhood made acquainted with the demands of the law.²⁴ That this education in the law was, in the first place, the duty and task of parents is self-evident. But it appears, that even in the age of Christ, care was also taken for the instruction of youth by the erection of schools on the part of the community. It does not indeed say much, when later tradition tells us that

²⁰ *Apion*. ii. 18: ‘Ημῶν δ’ ὄντινόν εἰ τις ἔροίτο τοὺς νόμους, βᾶν ἂν εἴποι πάντας ἢ τοῦνομα τὸ ἑαυτοῦ. Τοιγαροῦν ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης εὐθύς αἰσθήσεως αὐτοὺς ἐκμανθάνοντες ἔχομεν ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὥσπερ ἐγκεχαραγμένους, καὶ σπάνιος μὲν ὁ παραβαίνειν, ἀδύνατος δ’ ἡ τῆς κολάσεως παραίτησις.

²¹ *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 31, Mang. ii. 577. Θεόχρηστα γὰρ λόγια τοὺς νόμους εἶναι ὑπολαμβάνοντες, καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας τὸ μάθημα παιδευθέντες, ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἀγαλματοφοροῦσι τὰς τῶν διατεταγμένων εἰκόνας.

²² *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 31, Mang. ii. 577: Διδιδαγμένους ἐξ αὐτῶν τρόποις τινὰ σπαργάνων ὑπὸ γονέων καὶ παιδαγωγῶν καὶ ὑφηγητῶν, καὶ πολὺ πρότερον τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων καὶ ἔτι τῶν ἀγράφων ἐθῶν, ἵνα νομίζῃεν τὸν πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν τοῦ κόσμου θεόν.

²³ *Vita*, 2.

²⁴ In Christian communities also children were instructed in the Holy Scriptures. *Comp. 2 Tim. iii. 15*: ἀπὸ βρέφους ἱερὰ γράμματα οἶδας.

Simon ben Shetach already prescribed that children (תינוקות) should frequent the elementary schools (בית הספר).²⁵ For this Simon ben Shetach is quite a point of meeting for all kinds of myths. In any case however, in the period of the Mishna, and therefore at latest in the second century after Christ, the existence of elementary schools is assumed. There are *e.g.* legal decisions with regard to the חֲזַן (servant of the congregation), who instructs children (תינוקות) in reading on the Sabbath.²⁶ Or it is ordained, that an idle man shall not keep a school for children, לֹא יִלְמֹד אָדָם רוֹק כּוֹפְרִים.²⁷ Or it is appointed, that in certain cases the testimony of an adult with respect to what he saw as a child (קֶמֶן) in the elementary school (בית הספר) is valid.²⁸ Hence the later tradition, that Joshua ben Gamla (= Jesus the son of Gamaliel) enacted that teachers of boys (מְלַמְדֵי תִינוּקוֹת) should be appointed *in every province and in every town*, and that children of the age of six or seven should be brought to them, is by no means incredible.²⁹ The only Jesus the son of Gamaliel known to history is the high priest of that name, about 63–65 after Christ (see above, vol. i. p. 201). It must therefore be he who is intended in the above notice. As his measures presuppose a somewhat longer existence of boys' schools, we may without

²⁵ *Jer. Kethuboth* viii. 11 (32^c above).

²⁶ *Shabbath* i. 3.

²⁷ *Kiddushin* iv. 13.

²⁸ *Kethuboth* ii. 10.

²⁹ *Bab. Baba bathra* 21^a: "Rab Judah said in the name of the Rabbi: Truly it may be remembered to this man's credit! Joshua ben Gamla is his name. If he had not lived, the law would have been forgotten in Israel. For at first, he who had a father was taught the law by him, he who had none did not learn the law. . . Afterwards it was ordained, that teachers of boys should be appointed in Jerusalem. . . . But he who had a father was sent to school by him, he who had none did not go there. Then it was ordained, that teachers should be appointed in every province, and that boys of the age of sixteen or seventeen should be sent to them. But he whose teacher was angry with him ran away, till Joshua ben Gamla came and enacted, that teachers should be appointed in every province and in every town (בְּכָל מְדִינָה וּבְכָל עִיר וְעִיר), and children of six or seven years old brought to them."

hesitation transfer them to the age of Christ, even though not as a general and established institution.

The *subject of instruction*, as already appears from the above passages of Josephus and Philo, was as good as exclusively the law. For only its inculcation in the youthful mind, and not the means of general education, was the aim of all this zeal for the instruction of youth. And indeed the earliest instruction was in the reading and inculcation of the *text of Scripture*. Hence the elementary school was called simply the *בֵּית הַסֵּפֶר*, because it had to do with the book of the Thorah, or as is once expressly declared, with the text of Scripture (the *מִקְרָא*) in distinction from *בֵּית הַמִּדְרָשׁ*, which was devoted to further "study."³⁰ It was therefore at bottom only the interest in the law, which made instruction in reading pretty widely diffused. For since in the case of the written Scripture (in distinction from oral tradition) great importance was attached to its being actually *read* (see below on the order of public worship), elementary instruction in the law was necessarily combined with instruction in reading. A knowledge of reading must therefore be everywhere assumed, where a somewhat more thorough knowledge of the law existed. Hence we find even in pre-Christian times *books of the law* in the possession of private individuals.³¹ On the other hand however the difficult art of writing was less general.³²

Habitual practice went hand in hand with theoretical instruction. For though children were not actually *bound* to fulfil the law, they were yet accustomed to it from their youth

³⁰ *Jer. Megilla* iii. 1 (73d): "R. Pinchas said in the name of R. Hoshaiah that there were 480 synagogues in Jerusalem, and each had a Beth-Sefer and a Beth-Talmud, the former for the *Mikra* (the text of Scripture), the latter for the *Mishna* (the oral tradition)."

³¹ *Comp. 1 Macc. i. 56 sq.* In the *Mishna*, *Jebamoth* xvi. 7, a story is told of a Levite, who died on a journey, in an inn, and whose property consisted of a stick, a travelling-bag, and a *book of the law*.

³² *Comp. Winer, RWB., art. "Schreibkunst."*

up. It was made a duty of adults *e.g.* to enjoin children to keep the Sabbath.³³ Children were to be gradually accustomed to strict fasting on the day of atonement one or two years before the age when it was incumbent.^{33a} Certain points were even binding upon children. They were not bound indeed *e.g.* to the reading of the Shema and the putting on of Tephillin, but they were so to the usual prayer (the Shemoneh Esreh) and to prayer at table.³⁴ Boys had to be present at the tenderest age in the temple at the chief festivals.³⁵ Especially were boys bound to the observance of the feast of Tabernacles.³⁶ As soon then as the first signs of manhood appeared, the growing Israelite was bound to the full observance of the law,³⁷ he then entered upon all the rights and duties of a full-grown Israelite, and was henceforth a בֵּר מִצְוָה.³⁸ Thus the widely-diffused opinion, supported

³³ *Shabbath* xvi. 6.

^{33a} *Joma* viii. 4.

³⁴ *Berachoth* iii. 3: "Women, slaves and children are released from reading the Shema and from the Tephillin, but are bound to the Tephilla (the Shemoneh Esreh), to the Mesusa, and prayer at table."

³⁵ *Chagiga* i. 1: "Every one is bound to appear in the temple at the chief feasts, except the deaf, idiots, children, eunuchs, mongrels, women, unemancipated slaves, the lame, blind, sick, infirm, and generally those who cannot walk. What is here meant by a child (קטן)? According to the school of Shammai: Every one who cannot yet ride upon his father's shoulder from Jerusalem to the temple mount. But the school of Hillel said: Every one who cannot yet go up from Jerusalem to the temple mount led by his father's hand." It may indeed be inferred from Luke ii. 42, that as a rule those dwelling away from Jerusalem took part in the pilgrimages from their twelfth year.

³⁶ *Sukka* ii. 8: "Women, slaves and children are free from the law of the feast of Tabernacles. A child however, who no longer needs his mother, is bound by it. The daughter-in-law of Shammai the elder once brought forth a son at the feast of Tabernacles. He then left the roof open and covered it in over the bed with branches for the sake of the child." *Sukka* iii. 15: "A boy who is capable of shaking the lulab is bound to keep it."

³⁷ *Nidda* vi. 11: "A boy in whom the two hairs appear is bound to all the commands which are said in the law." The like applies to girls, with the difference, that women neither share in all the rights nor in all the legal duties of men.

³⁸ The expression Bar-Mizvah is found already in the Talmud (*Baba*

especially by the remarks of Lightfoot and Wetzstein on Luke ii. 42, that the attainment of the twelfth year formed the boundary between being bound and not bound to the observance of the law, is in two respects inaccurate: first, because a younger boy was bound by certain precepts, and next because no definite age but the signs of approaching puberty formed this boundary. Besides, when a definite age was subsequently fixed, it was not that of twelve, but of thirteen years.³⁹

II. THE SYNAGOGUE.

THE LITERATURE.

Maimonides, *Hilchoth Tephilla* (in his great work *Mishne Thorah*), gives a systematic statement of such tradition concerning the nature of the synagogue as was held valid in his time.

mezia 96^a below, see Levy's *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* i. 258^b), but was not generally used as the designation of a full-grown Israelite till the Middle Ages, see Löw, *Die Lebensalter*, pp. 210, 410.

³⁹ Thus in the appendix (a work of the post-Talmudic period) to the treatise *Aboth*, *Aboth* v. 21: "At five years old (he comes) to the reading of Scripture, at ten to the Mishna, at *thirteen* (בן שלש עשרה) to the *practice of the commands*, at fifteen to the Talmud, at eighteen to marriage," etc. In a special point, viz. the absolute validity of the oath, the attainment of the thirteenth year was also already appointed in the Mishna; see *Nidda* v. 6: "When a child is twelve years and one day old, his oaths are tested; when he is thirteen years and a day, they are valid without further ceremony." Comp. Löw, *Die Lebensalter*, p. 143 sqq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. art. "Mizva." The material contributed by Lightfoot (*Horae hebr.*) and Wetzstein (*Nov. Test.*) on Luke ii. 42 does not prove, that the twelfth year formed the boundary between obligation and non-obligation. On the one hand, only the views of individual authorities, which are opposed by other authorities, are on the whole dealt with; and on the other it is only said by them, that the strict *practice* of the law had to begin at twelve years of age, not that its *obligation* then began; so especially in the passages *Joma* 82^a, *Kethuboth* 50^a. Nor can more be inferred from Luke ii. 42, than that at the age of twelve the strict *practice* of the law began.

Vitringa, *De synagoga vetere libri tres: quibus tum de nominibus, structura, origine, praelectis, ministris et sacris synagogarum agitur, tum praecipue formam regiminis et ministerii earum in ecclesiam christianum translatam esse demonstratur*, Franequerae 1696.

Joh. Gottl. Carpzov, *Apparatus historico criticus* (1748), pp. 307-326.

A number of older monographs on single subjects is collected in Ugolini's *Thesaurus Antiquitatum sacrarum*, vol. xxi.

Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen* (1831), pp. 225-376.

Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (1832), pp. 1-12, 329-360.

Winer, *Realwörterb.* ii. 548-551, "Synagogen."

Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 129-137, 183-226.

Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, i. 168 ff.

Keil, *Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie* (2nd ed. 1875), pp. 164 ff., 444 ff.

Leyrer, art. "Synagogen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. xv. (1862), pp. 299-314.

De Wette, *Lehrb. der hebr.-jüd. Archäologie* (4th ed. 1864), pp. 369-374.

Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.*, 2nd ed. vol. i. (1873) pp. 73-80.

Haneberg, *Die religiösen Alterthümer der Bibel* (1869), pp. 349-355, 582-587.

Ginsburg, art. "Synagogue," in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*.

Plumptre, art. "Synagogue," in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*.

Kneucker, art. "Synagogen," in Schenkel's *Bibelllex.* v. pp. 443-446.

Sieffert, *Die jüdische Synagoge zur Zeit Jesu (Beweis des Glaubens)*, 1876, pp. 3-11, 225-239).

Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. 1883, art. "Synagoge."

Löw, Leop., *Der synagogale Ritus (Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.)* 1884, pp. 97 ff., 161 ff., 214 ff., 305 ff., 364 ff., 458 ff.).

Strack, art. "Synagogen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. xv. 96-100.

A deeper and more professional acquaintance with the law could only be obtained at the feet of the scribes in the Beth-ha-Midrash (see above, § 25). It was in the nature of things, that only a small fraction would acquire this. For the bulk of the people it was no small advantage, if only an elementary knowledge should become and remain a common property. But even this object was only attainable through an institution,

by means of which the law was being brought nearer and nearer during his whole life to each individual of the nation. Such an institution was created by post-exilian Judaism in the custom of the reading of Scripture on the Sabbath day in the synagogue. For it is necessary first of all to remark, that the *main object* of these Sabbath day assemblages in the synagogue was not public worship in its stricter sense, *i.e.* not devotion, but religious instruction, and this for an Israelite was above all *instruction in the law*. Josephus rightly views the matter in this light: "Not once or twice or more frequently did our lawgiver command us to hear the law, but to come together weekly, with the cessation of other work, to hear the law and to learn it accurately."⁴⁰ Nor was Philo in the wrong, when he called the synagogues "houses of instruction," in which "the native philosophy" was studied and every kind of virtue taught.⁴¹ In the New Testament too, the διδάσκειν always figures as the chief function of the synagogue.⁴² The *origin* of these meetings on the Sabbath in buildings erected for the purpose, must at any rate be sought for in the post-exilian period. The first traces of them are the לְבֵית הַתּוֹרָה of Ps. lxxiv. 8, probably of the Maccabaeian era. But their commencement may well be transposed considerably farther back, perhaps to the time of Ezra. In the times of Christ

⁴⁰ *Apion*. ii. 7: Οὐκ εἰσάπαξ ἀκροασαμένους οὐδὲ δις ἢ πολλάκις, ἀλλ' ἑκάστης ἡμέρας τῶν ἄλλων ἔργων ἀφεμένους ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρόασιν τοῦ νόμου ἐκέλευσε συλλέγεσθαι καὶ τοῦτον ἀκριβῶς ἐκμανθάνειν.

⁴¹ *Vita Mosi*, iii. 27 (Mang. ii. 168): 'Αφ' οὗ καὶ εἰσέτι νῦν φιλοσοφοῦσι ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἰουδαῖοι τὴν πατριὴν φιλοσοφίαν, τὸν χρόνον ἐκείνου ἀναθέντες ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ θεωρίᾳ τῶν περὶ φύσιν. Τὰ γὰρ κατὰ πόλεις προσευκτήρια τὸ ἑτερόν ἐστιν ἢ διδασκαλεῖα φρονήσεως καὶ ἀνδρίας καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης, εὐσεβείας τε καὶ ὁσιότητος καὶ συμπάσης ἀρετῆς, ἣ κατανοεῖται καὶ κατορθοῦνται τὰ τε ἀνθρώπεια καὶ θεῖα. *Comp. Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23 (Mang. ii. 568): 'Ἐπίστατο οὖν (scil. Augustus of the Roman Jews) καὶ προσευχὰς ἔχοντας καὶ συνιόντας εἰς αὐτάς, καὶ μάλιστα ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἡμέραις, ὅτε δημοσίᾳ τὴν πατριὴν παιδεύονται φιλοσοφίαν.

⁴² *Matt.* iv. 23; *Mark* i. 21; *Luke* iv. 15, 31, vi. 6, xiii. 10; *John* vi. 59, xviii. 20,

the "teaching in the synagogue on the Sabbath day" was already an established and naturalized institution (Mark i. 21, vi. 2; Luke iv. 16, 31, vi. 6, xiii. 10; Acts xiii. 14, 27, 42, 44, xv. 21, xvi. 13, xvii. 2, xviii. 4). According to Acts xv. 21, Moses "had from generations of old (*ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων*) in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath." Josephus and Philo, and subsequent Judaism in general, trace back the whole system to Moses himself.⁴⁸ This is indeed of interest only as showing that later Judaism regarded it as an essential element of its religious institutions. The utter absence of testimony forbids our thinking of a pre-exilian origin.

The whole system presupposes above all things the existence of a *religious community*. And here the question arises, whether in the time of Christ the civil and religious community was so separated in the towns and provinces of Palestine, that the latter possessed an independent organization. To gain clearness on the subject, we must first consider that the political constitution differed in the different towns of Palestine. We have seen (vol. i. p. 148) that a *threefold variety* was in this respect possible, and actually existed. The

⁴⁸ Comp. besides the two already cited passages (Joseph. *contra Apion.* ii. 17; Philo, *Vita Mosis*, iii. 27), especially Philo, *fragm. apud Euseb. Praep. evang.* viii. 7, in Vitringa, p. 283 sqq. The statement of Winer (*RWB.* ii. 548, referring to his *Diss. de Jonathanis in Pentat. paraphrasi chald.* i. 30), that the Targums transfer the institution to the patriarchal period, is not quite correct. It is certainly said in Onkelos, Gen. xxv. 27, that Jacob served in a house of instruction (*בית אולפנא*), and in *Targ. Jerus.* 1, Gen. xxxiii. 17, that Jacob built a house of teaching (*בית מדרשא*). But in neither case is a *synagogue* proper intended. In *Targ. Jerus.* 1, Ex. xviii. 20, it is said, that the father-in-law of Moses exhorted him to teach the people the prayer, which they were to use in their synagogue (*בבית בנישתיק*). But here the age of the patriarchs in the stricter sense is out of question. So too do the other passages quoted by Winer equally refer to a later period. It would nevertheless be quite in accordance with the spirit of the Targums to transpose the synagogues also to the times of the patriarchs.

Jews might be excluded from civic rights, or Jews and non-Jews might have equal civil rights, or Jews only might be in possession of them. The first two cases were possible in towns with a chiefly Greek or strongly mixed population. In both cases the Jews would, in respect of their religious wants, be thrown back upon self-organization as a religious community. For whether they co-operated or not in the direction of civil affairs, the necessity of independent organization for religious matters was the same. *In both these cases therefore the question started must be answered in the affirmative*, and consequently the position of the synagogal community would be the same in these towns as in those of the Dispersion. Quite different however was the state of affairs in towns of an entirely or an almost exclusively Jewish population. Here the local authorities certainly consisted of Jews, and the few non-Jewish inhabitants were excluded from the college of elders or town senate. Of this there is no doubt with respect to Jerusalem. Since then the local authorities had often to deal also with religious affairs (for the Jewish law knows of no severance of these from civil affairs), it is *a priori* very probable, that the matters of the synagogue were under their jurisdiction. Or would a separate council of elders be appointed for this special purpose? In small places at all events this would have been very unnatural. But even in the larger towns, where there were several synagogues, there was no occasion for it. It was enough if the necessary *officials* for each synagogue (a ruler of the synagogue, an almoner and a minister), who had to care for its special concerns, were appointed by the local authorities. At least there was no urgent reason for the formation of a college of elders for each separate synagogue, though with the scantiness of our material we have to concede the possibility of this being done. Nay, in one case it is even probable; for the Hellenistic Jews in Jerusalem, the Liber-

tines, Cyrenians, Cilicians and Asiatics evidently formed separate communities (Acts vi. 9).⁴⁴ But these were special circumstances, the difference of nationality making a special organization necessary. A separation of the political and religious community would have been quite unnatural for the simple circumstances especially of the smaller places of Palestine. It would disagree with the character of post-exilian Judaism, which indeed knows of the political, only in the form of the religious community. But there are not wanting also positive proofs, that the civil community as such also directed the affairs of the synagogue. In the Mishna *e.g.* it is presupposed as quite self-evident, that the synagogue, the sacred ark, and the sacred books were quite as much the property of the town, and therefore of the civic community, as *e.g.* the roads and the bathing establishment.⁴⁵ The inhabitants of the town (בְּנֵי הָעִיר) had therefore the right of disposing of the former as of the latter.⁴⁶ When Eleasar ben Asariah says, that the Musaph-prayer may only be used in a town congregation (בְּתִקְוָה עִיר), we may infer that the town congregation included the civic community as such in the synagogue

⁴⁴ The *Διβερτινός* can only be Roman "freed men" and their descendants, therefore descendants of those Jews, whom Pompey despatched as prisoners to Rome, and who were there soon liberated by their masters (Philo, *Leg. ad Cajum*, § 23. M. ii. 568). Many of these may have subsequently returned to Jerusalem and have here formed a separate congregation. So too the numerous Hellenistic Jews from Cyrene, Alexandria, Cilicia and Asia dwelling in Jerusalem formed separate congregations. For the old matter of dispute as to how the passage from the Acts is to be construed, whether so as to make it mention *one* or *two* or *five* synagogues, must certainly be decided in the latter sense (so already, Vitringa, p. 253).

⁴⁵ *Nedarim* v. 5: "Things which belong to a town are *e.g.* the roads, the bathing institution, the synagogue, the sacred chest or ark, the sacred books."

⁴⁶ *Megilla* iii. 1: "If the inhabitants of a town have sold the open place of the town, they may with the produce buy a synagogue; if a synagogue, then a sacred ark; if a sacred ark, then veils for the Holy Scriptures; if these, then the Holy Scriptures; if these, then a book of the law."

worship.⁴⁷ We may consequently assume it as probable that the congregation of the synagogue had only in towns with a mixed population an independent existence beside the political community. *In purely Jewish localities, the elders of the place will have been also the elders of the synagogue.* So far as the community is viewed as religious, it is called בְּנֵי־הַכְּנֶסֶת (properly assembly, Greek συναγωγή, Aramaean כְּנִישְׁתָּא), its members therefore בְּנֵי הַכְּנֶסֶת.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ *Berachoth* iv. 7: "R. Eleasar ben Asariah says: The Musaph-prayer (that added to the usual prayer on Sabbaths and holy days) is only used in a town congregation. The learned say: In a town congregation and outside one. R. Judah says in the name of the latter: Wherever there is a town congregation, an individual is free from the Musaph-prayer." The unusual word חֶבֶר עִיר is, it is true, variously explained. Since however it means in any case an associated community (not as Maimonides explains it, an individual scholar), and since the religious community is elsewhere called, not חֶבֶר, but כְּנֶסֶת, חֶבֶר must mean just a civil associated community, which also very well suits the passage cited from *Megilla* 27^b, by Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb. s.v.*

⁴⁸ *Bechoroth* v. 5; *Sabim* iii. 2. בְּנֵי־הַכְּנֶסֶת must be written, not with Segol, but with Tsere in the penultimate. Comp. the Aramaic כְּנִישְׁתָּא, and *Cod. de Rossi* 138, where indeed בְּנֵי־הַכְּנֶסֶת is not quite constantly but still in most passages correctly pointed. The Greek συναγωγή is used in the sense of "congregation," e.g. *Acts* vi. 9, ix. 2. *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. ii. p. 1004 sq. Add. n. 2114^b, 2114^{bb} (*Inscriptions of the Pantikapaion in the Cimmerian Bosphorus*): συνεπιτροπείσης τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Frequently in Roman-Judaic epitaphs. *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9902 sqq. That it was in later Judaism the usual expression for "congregation" is evident, especially from the language of the Fathers, who only distinguish between συναγωγή and ἐκκλησία to make the former signify the Jewish, the latter the Christian congregation. Nay the Ebionites retained the expression συναγωγή for the Christian congregation also (*Epiphan. haer.* xxx. 18: συναγωγῆν δὲ οὗτοι καλοῦσι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ οὐχὶ ἐκκλησίαν). And even in patristic literature συναγωγή is sometimes used for the Christian congregation (see Harnack, *Zeitschr. für Wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1876, p. 104 sqq., and his note on *Hermas Mandat.* xi. 9, in Gebhardt and Harnack's edition of the *Patr. Apostol.*). In Christian Palestinian Aramaic, כְּנִישְׁתָּא, which answers to the Greek συναγωγή, seems to have been the usual word for "church" (see Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, iv. 217. Zahn, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, p. 335). Still in the Christian sphere ἐκκλησία has certainly from the first, even from the time of St. Paul, maintained the supremacy. This contrast between the Jewish and Christian usage of

The *authority of the elders of the community* in religious matters must be conceived of as analogous to that which they possessed in civil affairs. As then the civil administration and jurisdiction were entirely in their hands, so presumably was the direction of religious matters exclusively their affair. There is at least no trace of any direct deliberation and determination of the whole congregation in individual cases of

language is at first sight strange, since no actual distinction is made in the Old Testament between *συναγωγή* and *ἐκκλησία*. The LXX. put *συναγωγή* for *עדה*, and as a rule *ἐκκλησία* for *קהל*; as the Targums do *בנישתא* for *עדה*, and generally *קהלא* for *קהל*. The former is chiefly used in the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Joshua, the latter in Deuteronomy, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah (for particulars see the Concordances), both very frequently without real difference to designate the "congregation" of Israel. Later Judaism however seems already to have made a distinction in the use of the two terms, and such an one that *συναγωγή* designated the congregation more on the side of its empirical reality, *ἐκκλησία* more on that of its ideal signification; *συναγωγή* being the associated congregation as constituted in some one place; *ἐκκλησία*, on the other hand, the assembly of those called by God to salvation, especially like *קהל*, the ideal church of Israel (on *קהל*, comp. in the Mishna, *Jebamoth* viii. 2; *Kidlushin* iv. 3; *Horajoth* i. 4-5; *Jadajim* iv. 4). When then Augustine says *συναγωγή* = *congregatio*, which is used also of animals, *ἐκκλησία* = *convocatio*, which is on the contrary used rather of men (see *Enarrat. in Ps. lxxi.* 1), this much at least is true, that the latter is in fact the worthier term. *Συναγωγή* only expresses the empiric matter of fact, *ἐκκλησία* contains as well a dogmatic judgment of value. From this distinction between the terms which, as it seems, soon became a prevailing one even in Judaism, it is easily understood, that Christian usage took possession almost exclusively of the latter expression. Lastly, we have here to note in passing the expression *צבור* so frequently used in the Mishna. It denotes generally the Church, not as a community, but only as an aggregate in contrast to the individual, thus e.g. in the yet to be discussed expression *שְׁלֵיחַ צְבוּר*, *Berachoth* v. 5; *Rosh hashana* iv. 9. In sacrificial language the public sacrifices, which were offered in the name of all Israel, are *קרבנות צבור*, *Shekalim* iv. 1, 6; *Sukka* v. 7; *Sebachim* xiv. 10; *Menachoth* ii. 2, viii. 1, ix. 6, 7, 9; *Temura* ii. 1; *Kerithoth* i. 6; *Para* ii. 1. Comp. also *חטאת צבור*, *Toma* vi. 1; *Sebachim* v. 3 and elsewhere; *זבחי שלמי צבור*, *Pesachim* vii. 4; *Sebachim* v. 5 and elsewhere. A public fast is called a fast, which was ordered, *על הצבור*, *Taanith* i. 5, 6, ii. 9, 10. *צבור* then is everywhere not the "community," but the "aggregate."

discipline and government, of the kind which we meet with in the Christian Church at Corinth. In the Jewish community, on the contrary, these were administered by means of appointed officials, *i.e.* the elders of the congregation. In particular were the latter very probably competent to exercise that most important act of religious discipline, the *infliction of excommunication or exclusion from the congregation*. The strict administration of this means of discipline was for post-exilian Judaism nothing less than a vital question. In its continual contact with its heathen neighbours, the Jewish Church could only keep itself intact by the most careful separation from itself of all foreign elements. As then the firmer organization of the post-exilian Church had begun by the proclamation, that every one who would not submit to the new order should be excluded from the congregation (Ezra x. 8), so had care to be continually exercised for the exclusion of opposing elements in the way of Church discipline. That this regulation actually existed in the time of Christ is proved by repeated allusions in the New Testament (Luke vi. 22; John ix. 22, xii. 42, xvi. 2). The only question is, whether there were various kinds of exclusion. Many scholars have, after the example of Elias Levita († 1549) in his "*Tishbi*," distinguished three different kinds: (1) נָדָרִי, (2) חָרָם, (3) שְׁמָתָא. Of these however the latter forthwith falls away, נָדָרִי and שְׁמָתָא being, as Buxtorf already showed, used in the Talmud synonymously.⁴⁹ Only the distinction between two kinds has been handed down: the נָדָרִי or temporary exclusion, and the חָרָם or permanent ban.⁵⁰ It is however difficult to say how old this distinction is. All that is directly testified to in the New Testament is the ἀφορίζειν (Luke vi. 22) or ἀποσυνάγωγου ποιεῖν or γίνεσθαι (John ix. 22, xii. 42, xvi. 2), therefore

⁴⁹ *Lex. Chald.* col. 2462-2470 (*s.v.* שְׁמָתָא). Comp. also Levy, *Chald Wörterb.* *s.v.* חָרָם.

⁵⁰ So Maimonides in Vitringa, *De synagoga*, p. 739.

only the custom of expulsion as such. When in the well-known passage of the First Epistle to the Corinthians the expression *παράδουναι τῷ Σατανᾷ* (ver. 5) also occurs beside *αἶρεν ἐκ μέσου* (ver. 2), it is just a question, whether by the former we are to understand a stricter form of excommunication. In the Mishna too expulsion is only mentioned as such and the possibility of readmission assumed.⁵¹ On the other side, the Old Testament is already acquainted with the term חָרַם, i.e. the permanent excommunication or curse; and that it was current (in the sense of the curse) at least as a dogmatic notion to later Judaism also, is proved by the expressions *ἀνάθεμα* and *ἀναθεματίζειν* so repeatedly occurring in the New Testament (Rom. ix. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22; Gal. i. 8, 9; Mark xiv. 71; Acts xxiii. 12, xiv. 21). The actual practice of anathematizing in the synagogues is proved from the 2nd century after Christ and onwards by the statement of Justin and other Fathers, that the Jews in their daily prayer always pronounced curses upon the Christians.^{51a} It is true that the infliction of the *ἀνάθεμα* upon certain individuals is not here spoken of, and it is also questionable, whether the curses were pronounced directly upon Christians. But at any rate the actual custom of anathematizing in public worship at that period is proved. It is therefore at least possible, that so early as the time of Christ, two kinds of exclusion from the congregation took place, either without or with the infliction of the *ἀνάθεμα*. Nothing more definite can be asserted in the absence of direct evidence.⁵² It is

⁵¹ *Taanith* iii. 8; *Moed katan* iii. 1-2; *Edujoth* v. 6; *Middoth* ii. 2.

^{51a} Justin. *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 16. Epiphani. *haer.* xxix. 9. Further particulars in the appendix on the Shemoneh Esreh.

⁵² Compare on the excommunication in general, Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.*, col. 827-829 (s.v. חָרַם), col. 1303-1307 (s.v. נָרַי), col. 2462-2470 (s.v. שְׁמֹנֶה עָשָׂר). Selden, *De synedriis*, lib. i. cap. viii. Vitranga, *De synagoga*, pp. 729-768. Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, pp. 554-562. Bindrim, *De gradibus excommunicationis apud Hebraeos*, in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxvi. Gottl. Isr. Musculus, *De excommunicatione Hebraeorum et ejusdem in*

highly probable that only the elders of the congregation were authorized to inflict this extreme penalty. For as in post-exilic Judaism the bulk of the people as such nowhere—so far as we know—exercised jurisdiction, we must not assume it with respect to excommunication. In fact we see, *e.g.* from John ix. 22, that it was inflicted by the *'Ioudaiois*, *i.e.* in the language of this Gospel, by the authorities of the nation. And this is indirectly confirmed by the circumstance, that in the era of the Mishna, when the political organization of the nation was dissolved, and the professional scribes more and more acquired the powers of the former local authorities, it was just the “learned” (חֲכָמִים) who inflicted and abolished excommunication.⁵³ In the Talmudic and post-Talmudic periods also, this was in the hands of competent church authorities.⁵⁴

Besides the elders who had the general direction of the affairs of the congregation, special officers were appointed for special purposes. But the peculiarity here is, that just for the acts proper to public worship—the reading of the Scriptures, preaching and prayer—no special officials were appointed. These acts were, on the contrary, in the time of Christ still freely performed in turn by members of the congregation, on which account *e.g.* Christ was able, whenever

Novo Testamento vestigiis, Lips. 1703. Danz, *Ritus excommunicationis* (in Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, pp. 615-648). For other and older discussions, see Meusel, *Bibliotheca historica*, i. 2. 198 sq. Winer, *RWB.*, art. “Bann.” Merx in Schenkel's *Bibellex. s.v.* Hamburger, *Real-Enc. f. Bibel und Talmud*, Div. i. s.v. Wiesner, *Der Bann in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Leipzig 1864.

⁵³ See especially *Moed katan* iii. 1-2.

⁵⁴ In Justinian's *Novell.* 146, in which the reading of the Greek text of the Scriptures is allowed in Jewish synagogues, and the Jewish authorities directed not to obstruct this by the infliction of excommunication, in respect of the latter it is said: Οὐδὲ ἄδειαν ἔξουσιν οἱ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀρχιφερεῖται ἢ πρεσβύτεροι τυχόν ἢ διδάσκαλοι προσαγορευόμενοι περινοίαις τισὶν ἢ ἀναθεματισμοῖς τοῦτο κωλύειν. Maimonides assumes it as self-evident, that excommunication is inflicted by the בֵּית דִּין. See on the subject in general, Vitrina, pp. 744-751.

He came into a synagogue, to immediately address the congregation (see further particulars below on the order of public worship). But though no official readers, preachers and liturgists were appointed, it was above all necessary that: (1) An official should be nominated, who should have the care of external order in public worship and the supervision of the concerns of the synagogue in general. This was the *Ruler of the synagogue*.⁵⁵ Such ἀρχισυναγωγοί are met with in the entire sphere of Judaism, not only in Palestine,⁵⁶ but also in Egypt,⁵⁷ Asia Minor,⁵⁸ Greece,⁵⁹ Italy,⁶⁰ and the Roman Empire in general.⁶¹ The office and title were also transferred from the Jews to the Judæo-Christian churches of Palestine,⁶²

⁵⁵ Comp. on the Archisynagogi my article: *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom in der Kaiserzeit* (Leipzig 1879), pp. 25–28. The older literature is unproductive as jumbling together so much that is heterogeneous. We bring forward Vitringa, *Archisynagogus observationibus novis illustratus*, Franeq. 1685. Idem, *De synagoga vetere*, pp. 580–592, 695–711. Rhenferd, *Investigatio praelectorum et ministrorum synagogae*, c. i. (*Opp. phil.* p. 480 sqq.; also in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxi.).

⁵⁶ Mark v. 22, 35, 36, 38; Luke viii. 49, xiii. 14. *Evang. Nicodemi* in Thilo, *Codex apocr. Nov. Test.* pp. 514 sq., 640, 645 (= *Acta Pilati* in Tischendorf, *Evang. apocr.* 1876, pp. 221, 270, 275, 284).

⁵⁷ Hadrian's letter to Servianus in Vopiscus, *Vita Saturnin.* c. viii. (*Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, ed. Peter, 1865, ii. 209).

⁵⁸ Acts xiii. 15 (the Pisidian Antioch). Epiphan. *haer.* xxx. 11 (Cilicia). The Inscription of Smyrna, *Revue des études juives*, vol. vii. No. 14, 1883, p. 161 sq.

⁵⁹ Acts xviii. 8, 17 (Corinth). *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9894 (Aegina).

⁶⁰ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9906 (Rome). Garrucci, *Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei scoperto recentemente in Vigna Randanini*, p. 67 (Rome). Mommsen *Inscr. Regni Neap.* n. 3657 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 3905 (Capua). Ascoli, *Iscrizioni inedite o mal note greche latine ebraiche di antichi sepolcri giudaici*, 1880, p. 49, n. 1, pp. 52, 57 (Venusia in Lower Italy). The same three inscriptions in *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. (1883), n. 6201, 6205, 6232. The last two also in Lenormant, *La Catacombe juive de Venosa in Revue des études juives*, vol. vi. No. 12 (1883), pp. 203–204. The three first named inscriptions from Rome and Capua are given also in the appendix to my work, *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom*, Nos. 5, 19, 42.

⁶¹ *Codex Theodosianus* (ed. Haenel). xvi. 8. 4, 13, 14. Comp. also Justin. *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 137.

⁶² Epiphan. *haer.* xxx. 18: πρεσβυτέρους γὰρ οὗτοι ἔχουσι καὶ ἀρχισυναγώγους.

may it is also found occasionally in Christian churches beyond Palestine.^{62a} The Hebrew title הַגָּבֵר שֶׁנֶּאֱמָר⁶³ is undoubtedly synonymous with it. That this office differed from that of an elder of the congregation is proved by the joint occurrence of the titles *πρεσβύτεροι* and *ἀρχισυνάγωγοι*.⁶⁴ But it is most instructive, that according to the evidence of the inscriptions one and the same person could fill the offices of both *ἄρχων* and *ἀρχισυνάγωγος*.⁶⁵ The *ἄρχοντες* were in the Dispersion the "chiefs" of the congregation, in whose hands lay the direction in general. The office therefore of the Archisynagogos was at all events distinct from theirs. Nor can he have been the chief of the archontes, who was called *γερουσιάρχης* (see below, § 31, on the Dispersion).

^{62a} We have at least one example in North Africa. In the ruins of an ancient Basilica at Hammâm-el-Enf, in the neighbourhood of Tunis, is found an inscription, upon which, among other things, it is said: Asterius filius Rustici *acrosinagogi*, Margarita Riddei partem portici tessellavit. The monogram added, and certainly belonging to the original state of the inscription, proves the inscription to be Christian. Jewish influence is however seen in the addition of the seven-branched candlestick along with the Christian monogram. See *Ephemeris epigraphica*, vol. v. 1884, p. 537, n. 1222 (communicated by Johannes Schmidt after the *Bulletin épigraphique de la Gaule*, iii. 1883, p. 107).

⁶³ *Sota* vii. 7-8. At the blessing of the high priest on the day of atonement the procedure is as follows: "The minister of the synagogue (*chassan ha-keneseth*) takes a roll of the law and gives it to the archisynagogus (*rosh ha-keneseth*), he hands it to the president of the priests, and he to the high priest, who receives it standing and reads standing. . . . (8) At the reading of passages by the king on the first day of the feast of Tabernacles, the procedure is as follows: A wooden tribune (*βῆμα*) is erected for the king in the fore-court, and he takes his seat upon it. . . . The minister of the synagogue takes a roll of the law and hands it to the archisynagogus (*rosh ha-keneseth*), he hands it to the president of the priests, he to the high priest, he to the king, and the king receives it standing and reads sitting," etc. The first half of this passage is also in *Joma* vii. 1.

⁶⁴ Epiphan. *haer.* xxx. 11. 18. *Codex Theodosianus*, xvi. p. 13. *Acta Pilati* in Tischendorf, p. 221.

⁶⁵ Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 67, *Stafulo arconti et archisynagogo*. Mommsen, *Inscr. Regni Neap.* n. 3657. *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 3905; Alfius Juda, *arcon arcossynagogus*. Comp. also *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9906: Ἰουλιανὸς ἱερεὺς ἄρχων . . . υἱὸς Ἰουλιανοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου.

He had therefore nothing to do with the direction of the community in general. *His office was, on the contrary, that of specially caring for public worship.* He was called "archisynagogus," not as head of the community, but as conductor of their assembly for public worship. As a rule he was indeed taken out of the number of the elders of the congregation. Among his functions is specially mentioned *e.g.* that of appointing who should read the Scriptures and the prayer,⁶⁶ and summoning fit persons to preach.⁶⁷ He had to take care that nothing unfitting should take place in the synagogue (Luke xiii. 14), and had also the charge of the synagogue building.⁶⁸ There was generally but one archisynagogus for each synagogue. Sometimes however more than one are mentioned for one synagogue; so especially Acts xiii. 15 (ἀπέστειλαν οἱ ἀρχισυναγωγοὶ πρὸς αὐτούς), while the more indefinite expression εἰς τῶν ἀρχισυναγωγῶν (Mark v. 22) may also be explained as: one of the class of the presidents of the synagogues (see Weiss on the passage). In later times the title ἀρχισυναγωγος seems to have been bestowed as a mere title upon even minors and women.^{68a} It is remarkable that archisynagogi occur in *heathen worship* also. It may however be here left undecided, whether the use of the expression originated in the Jewish or heathen sphere.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ See Rashi, Bartenora and Sheringam on *Joma* vii. 1 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. 244, 246). Rashi, Bartenora and Sheringam on *Sota* vii. 7 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, iii. 266, 267).

⁶⁷ In Acts xiii. 15, Paul and Barnabas are summoned by the archisynagogi, in Antioch in Pisidia, to speak, if they have a λόγος παρακλήσεως.

⁶⁸ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9894. The archisynagogus in Aegina directs the building of a synagogue (ἐχ θεμελίωσεν τὴν συναγ[ωγὴν] οἰκοδόμησεν).

^{68a} *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 6201 (= Ascoli, *Iscrizioni*, p. 49, note 1): Καλλιστου νεπιου αρχισυναγωγου ετων γ μηνων γ. *Revue des études juives*, vol. vii. No. 14, p. 161 sq. : Πουφεινα Ιουδαία αρχισυναγωγος.

⁶⁹ Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 10. 4, mentions an ἀρχισυναγωγος τῶν ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου μάγων. Upon an inscription in Olynth (*Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. ii. p. 994, Addend. n. 2007^b) occurs an Αἰλιανὸς Νείκων ὁ ἀρχισυναγωγος θεοῦ ἥρωος καὶ τὸ κολλήγιον Βειβίῳ Ἀντανίῳ ἀνέστησεν τὸν βωμόν. Upon an

Besides the ruler of the synagogue, we meet with as officers of the congregation (2) the *receivers* of alms נְבָאֵי צְדָקָה.⁷⁰ They had certainly nothing to do with public worship as such, and are therefore, where the civil and the religious communities were not separated, to be regarded rather as civil officials. They must however be named here, because it was in the synagogues that the collection of alms took place.⁷¹ According to the Mishna the collection was to be made by at least two, the distribution by three persons.⁷² Not only was money collected (in the box, קופָּה), but also natural products (in the dish, תַּמְחוּי).⁷³ Lastly we have to name the minister, Hebr. חֲזַן הַכֶּנֶסֶת; ⁷⁴ Greek ὑπηρέτης.⁷⁵

inscription in Chios (*Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. ii. p. 1031, Addend. 2221^c) five [ἀρχισυ]νάγωγος οἱ ἀρχαντες. A jumble of religions being the order of the day in Egypt, and the two Greek inscriptions very recent, a borrowing from Judaism is very possible in all three cases. When lastly Alexander Severus was derisively called a *Syrus archisynagogus* (*Lamprid. Vita Alex. Sev.* c. 28, in *Script. Hist. Aug.* ed. Peter, i. 247), it is uncertain, whether we have to think of a heathen or Jewish archisynagogus.

⁷⁰ *Demai* iii. 1; *Kiddushin* iv. 5. In the latter passage it is said, that the posterity of the נְבָאֵי צְדָקָה are without special investigation accounted Israelites of pure blood, with whom members of the priestly class may intermarry. It is thus seen that they were really officials.

⁷¹ *Matt.* vi. 2, and Lightfoot (*Horae Hebr.*) thereon and Wetzstein (*Nov. Test.*); also Vitranga, *De synagoga*, p. 211 sq.

⁷² *Peah* viii. 7.

⁷³ *Peah* viii. 7; *Pesachim* x. 1. For more exact information concerning the functions of the almoners in Talmudic and post-Talmudic Judaism, see Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 375 (s.v. נְבָאֵי), 2095 (s.v. קופָּה), 2604 (s.v. תַּמְחוּי). Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. ad Matt.* vi. 2. Vitranga, *De synagoga*, p. 544. Rhenford, *De decem otiosis*, Diss. i. c. 78–88. Werner, *De fisco et paropside pauperum*, Jenae 1725 (cited by Winer, *RWB.* i. 46).

⁷⁴ *Sota* viii. 7–8; *Joma* vii. 1; *Makkoth* iii. 12; *Shabbath* i. 3 (in the latter passage only חֲזַן). Tosefta, ed. Zuckermann, p. 198, 23. 199. 8, 216. 7. Aramaic חֲזַנָּא, *Sota* ix. 15. Comp. Epiphanius, *haer.* xxx. 11: Ἀζανιτῶν τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς διακόνων ἐρμηνευομένων ἢ ὑπηρετῶν. The title is also found in mediaeval Hebrew epitaphs, e.g. in Paris (Longpérier, *Journal des Savants*, 1874, p. 668, n. 42). חֲזַנִּים also occur in the temple, *Sukka* iv. 4; *Tamid* v. 3.

⁷⁵ *Luke* iv. 20. Such a minister of the synagogue is certainly also meant in the Roman-Judaic epitaph: Φλαβιος Ιουλιανος ὑπηρετης. Φλαβιος

His office was to bring forth the Holy Scriptures at public worship and to put them by again.⁷⁶ He was in every respect the servant of the congregation, having *e.g.* to execute upon those condemned to it the punishment of scourging,⁷⁷ and also to instruct children in reading.⁷⁸ The שְׁלִיחַ צִבּוּר, who had to pronounce the prayer at public worship in the name of the congregation, is also generally regarded as one of its officers.⁷⁹ In truth however the prayer was not said by a permanent officer, but by any member of the congregation (see below on Public Worship). Hence whoever said the prayer in the name of the congregation was always called שְׁלִיחַ צִבּוּר, "plenipotentiary of the congregation." And the "ten unemployed men" (עֲשָׂרָה בְּמַלְלִין, *decem otiosi*), whose business it was, especially in the post-Talmudic period, to be always present for a fee in the synagogue at public worship, for the purpose of making up the number of ten members required for a religious assembly, are still less than the Sheliach-Zibbur to be regarded as officials.⁸⁰ Besides, the

Ιουλιανη θυγατηρ πατρι. Εν εἰρηνῇ ἡ κοίμησις σου (Garrucci, *Dissertazioni archeologiche di vario argomento*, vol. ii. 1865, p. 166, n. 22; also in my *Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom*, Appendix, No. 30).

⁷⁶ Sota vii. 7-8; Joma vii. 1; Luke iv. 20. The commentaries on Sota and Joma (Surenhusius' *Mishna*, iii. 266 sq., ii. 246).

⁷⁷ *Makkoth* iii. 12.

⁷⁸ *Shabbath* i. 3.

⁷⁹ *Berachoth* v. 5; *Rosh hashana* iv. 9.

⁸⁰ Buxtorf, *Lex Chald.* col. 292 (*s.v.* בְּמַלְלִין): Apud Rabbinos de decem בְּמַלְלִין crebra fit mentio. Sunt autem decem viri otiosi, Synagogae Judaicae quasi Stipendiarii, qui stipendium accipiunt, ut in precibus et aliis conventibus sacris, in Synagoga semper frequentes adsint et ab initio ad finem cum sacerdote aut sacrorum praefecto perdurent, ne synagoga unquam in sacris sit vacua aut sacerdos solus. This precise explanation of Buxtorf is confirmed by Rabbinical authorities, *e.g.* Rashi on *Baba kamma* 82a (in Vitranga, *De synagoga*, p. 532), Bartenora on *Megilla* i. 3 (Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. 388 sq.). In the Talmud the עֲשָׂרָה בְּמַלְלִין are not often mentioned, *Jer. Megilla* i. 6 (70b below), *Bab Megilla* 5a, *Baba kamma* 82a, *Sanhedrin* 17b (in Vitranga, *De decemviris otios*, c. 2; *De synag.* p. 531); as it is in none of these passages exactly stated what was the case with these men, Lightfoot was able to set up the mistaken hypothesis (*Horae Hebr. ad Matt.* iv. 23), that the *decem otiosi* were officials of the

arrangement was still quite unknown in the time of the Mishna. The expression itself occurs indeed in the Mishna,⁸¹ but it can originally have designated none else than such persons as were not prevented by business from visiting the synagogue even on week days. For on the Sabbath every Israelite was unemployed, and therefore *otiosum esse* would be no specific mark of individuals. That such is the meaning also in this passage of the Mishna is quite clear from the context. Hence the usual Sabbath day worship is not even thought of in it; and still less is it said, that in every congregation ten unemployed men must be present. On the contrary, it is only stated, as a mark of a large town, that even on week days there was always without difficulty a sufficient number of synagogue frequenters present. It was not till considerably later, that the above-named arrangement was made, and an altered meaning thus given to the term.

The *building*, in which the congregation assembled for public worship, was called *בֵּית הַכְּנֶסֶת*,⁸² Aramaic *בְּנֵי־שְׁתָּא* or merely *בְּנֵי־שְׁתָּא*,⁸³ Greek *συναγωγή*⁸⁴ or *προσ-*

synagogue, thus making the whole number of synagogue officials to consist of these ten men. This mistake called forth a learned controversy, in which Rhenford unsparingly, and Vitranga more gently, attacked Lightfoot's opinion. See especially, Rhenford, *De decem otiosis synagogae*, Franequerae 1686. Vitranga, *Dedecemviris otiosis*, Franequerae 1687 (both also in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxi.). Vitranga, *De synagoga*, pp. 530-549. A short statement of the whole controversy will be found in Carpzov's *Apparatus historico-crit.* pp. 310-312.

⁸¹ *Megilla* i. 3: "What is a large town? One in which are ten unemployed men. If there are fewer, it is a village."

⁸² In the Mishna in the following places: *Berachoth* vii. 3; **Terumoth* xi. 10; *Bikkurim* i. 4; *Erubim* x. 10; **Pesachim* iv. 4; *Sukka* iii. 13; *Rosh hashana* iii. 7; *Megilla* iii. 1-3; *Nedarim* v. 5, ix. 2; *Shebuoth* iv. 10; **Aboth* iii. 10; *Negaim* xiii. 12. In the passages marked * the plural form *בתי כנסיות* occurs.

⁸³ See Levy, *Chald. WB. s.v.* Idem, *Neuhebr. WB. s.v.*

⁸⁴ Frequently in the New Testament. In Josephus only three times, *Antt.* xix. 6. 3; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 4-5, vii. 3. 3. In Philo, *Quod omnis probis liber*, § 12, ed. Mang. ii. 458 (on the Essenes): εἰς ἑπεὺς ἀφικνούμενοι

ευχή.⁸⁵ The designations συναγωγήιον,⁸⁶ προσευκτήριον⁸⁷ and σαββατεῖον⁸⁸ appear in single instances. Synagogues were built by preference outside the towns and near rivers, or on the sea-shore for the sake of giving every one a convenient opportunity for performing such Levitical purification as might be necessary τόπους, οἱ καλοῦνται συναγωγαί. Frequently also in the later literature, e.g. *Codex Theodosianus*, xvi. 8, *passim*. Comp. also *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9894 (Aegina). The use of the term συναγωγή to designate a Christian place of worship can as yet be only twice pointed out, one strange to say among the anti-Judaistic Marcionites in an inscription of A.D. 319 at Deir-Ali, about three miles south of Damascus: συναγωγή Μαρκιωνιστῶν κάμ(ης) Λεβάβων (Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscriptions grecques et latines*, vol. iii. n. 2558. Comp. also Harnack, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1876, p. 103). The other example is the inscription of Hammâm el-Enf (already mentioned, note 62^a), which begins: Sancta synagoga Naron pro salutem suam ancilla tua Julia Gnar de suo proprio tessellavit (read: Sanctam synagogam Naron[itanam] pro salute sua ancilla tua Julia Nar[onitana] de suo proprio tessellavit).

⁸⁵ Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 6, 7, 14 (Mang. ii. 523, 524, 535). *Legat. ad Caj.* § 20, 23, 43, 46 (Mang. ii. 565, 568, 596, 600). Acts xvi. 13: ἔξω τῆς πόλεως παρὰ ποταμὸν οὗ ἐνομιζομεν προσευχὴν εἶναι. Joseph. *Vita*, c. 54: συνάγονται πάντες εἰς τὴν προσευχὴν, μέγιστον οἶκημα πολὺν ὄχλον ἐπιδέξασθαι δυνάμενον. *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. ii. p. 1004 sq. Addend. n. 2114b, 2114^{bb} (Inscriptions of Pantikapaion on the Cimmerian Bosphorus). Juvenal, *Sat.* iii. 296: Ede, ubi consistas, in qua te quaero proseucha? Gruter, *Corp. Inscr.* p. 651, n. 11: Dis M. P. Corfidio Signino pomario de aggere a proseucha, etc. (Corfidius of Signia, fruit seller at the wall near the proseuche.) Comp. 3 Macc. vii. 20: τόπον προσευχῆς. The word occurs also in heathen worship as the designation of a place of prayer. See *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 2079 (Inscription of Olbia on the Pontus Euxinus). Epiphanius, *haer.* lxxx. 1, on the heathen Massalians (see the words farther on). Also in Gruter, *Inscr.*, it is surely rather a heathen proseuche that is meant.

⁸⁶ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 40 (Mang. ii. 591). Idem, *De somniis*, ii. 18 (Mang. i. 675). *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9908: πατήρ συναγωγίων.

⁸⁷ Philo, *Vita Mosis*, iii. 27 (Mang. ii. 168).

⁸⁸ Joseph. *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2 (in an edict of Augustus). The learned Hug thought that a "Sabbath house" was also mentioned upon a Greek inscription at Thyatira (*Eink. in das N. T.* 4th ed. ii. § 89, p. 290). See *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 3509: Φάβιος Ζώσιμος κατασκευάσας σορόν ἔθετο ἐπὶ τόπου καθαρῷ, ὅπως πρὸ τῆς πόλεως πρὸς τῷ Σαμβαθείῳ ἐν τῷ Χαλδαίου περιβόλῳ κ.τ.λ. This Σαμβαθεῖον however is a sanctuary of the Chaldean or Persian sibyl, whose name was according to Suidas properly Σαμβήθη. See Stephanus, *Thes. s.v.* Σαμβήθη.

before attending public worship.^{88a} The size and architecture were of course very various.⁸⁹ In northern Galilee ruins of ancient synagogues are preserved to the present time, the oldest of which are of the second, nay possibly of the first century after Christ. They may perhaps give an idea of the style of building employed for synagogues in the time of Christ.^{89a} The large synagogue at Alexandria is said to have

^{88a} See especially Acts xvi. 13. Deutsch, *Sacra Judaeorum ad littora frequenter exstructa*, Lips. 1713. Comp. also note 92, below. There is not indeed a trace of this in Rabbinical literature, but on the contrary the injunction is to build the synagogues upon the highest point in the town (Tosefta, *Megilla* iv. p. 277, lin. 16 sq., ed. Zuckermantel). For this reason the fact asserted by us has been quite disputed by Löw (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1884, pp. 167–170). But this theoretic injunction is no proof that the custom existed (comp. note 117, below). Löw even points out, that synagogues were frequently built outside the towns (pp. 109 sqq., 161 sqq.). That in doing this the neighbourhood of water should be sought, where it was to be had, is at least very probable. Comp. Aristæas (ed. Mor. Schmidt, p. 67) on the seventy interpreters: ὡς δ' ἔθος ἐστὶ πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἀπομιφάμενοι τῇ θαλάσῃ τὰς χεῖρας, ὡς αὖ εὐξάνται πρὸς τὸν θεόν. Judith xii. 7. Clemens, *Alex. Strom.* iv. 22. 142. It is not said, that the hands must always be washed or bathed before prayer, but that one or the other must be done in proportion to the degree of Levitical uncleanness which may exist. Cautious persons may have preferred to do too much, rather than too little in this respect. See in general, Vitringa, *De synag.* pp. 1091, 1105 sq. It is well known, that the custom of washing the hands and of other lustrations was practised also in heathenism (*Odyss.* ii. 261, iv. 750 sqq.; *Ilias*, vi. 266 sq. Potter, *Archaeolog. graec.* ii. 4), and in the Christian church (see Tertullian, *De oratione*, c. 13: Ceterum quae ratio est, manibus quidem ablutis, spiritu vero sordente orationem obire. Passages from Chrysostom in Suicerus, *Sacrorum observationum*, lib. sing. p. 153). See in general, Pfannenschmidt, *Das Weihwasser im heidnischen und christlichen Cultus*, 1869.

⁸⁹ See in general, Löw, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissenschaft des Judenth.* 1884, p. 214 sqq.

^{89a} The importance and great antiquity of these ruins was already rightly recognised by Robinson (*Recent Biblical Researches*, vol. iii. pp. 70, 71, 74, 342, 346, 367, 368 sq.). They were afterwards thoroughly treated of especially by Renan (*Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 761–783). For delineations, see *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, vol. i. pp. 231, 232, 252, 397–399, 401. Comp. also the articles of Wilson and Kitchener in the *Quarterly Statement*, 1869 and 1878, printed in the *Survey*, etc. *Special Papers*, pp. 294–305. Also Bäder-Socin, *Palästina*, pp. 387, 390,

had the form of a Basilica.⁹⁰ It is possible, that they were sometimes built like theatres, without a roof, but this is only really testified concerning those of the Samaritans.⁹¹ It is certainly true, that on their fast days the Jews did not offer

391, 393, 394, 397. Ebers and Guthe, *Palästina*, i. 342-345, 502. Guérin, *Galilée*, i. 198-201, 227-231, 241 sq., ii. 95, 100 sq., 357 sq., 429 sq., 441, 447-449. On the ruins of Tell Hum specially, *The Recovery of Jerusalem*, by Wilson, Warren, etc. (1871), pp. 342-346. The ruins discovered are: *Kasiun, Kefr Birim, el-Djisch, Meiron, Nabartein, Kedes (?)*, *Tell Hum, Keraze, Irbid*. The five first lie west and south-west of Lake Merom, Kedes north-west (the meaning of the ruins there is however doubtful), Tell Hum and Keraze on the Lake of Gennesareth, Irbid north-west of Tiberias. In Kefr Birim, el-Djisch, Meiron and Irbid ruins are already spoken of by Jewish pilgrims of the Middle Ages, who for the most part attribute their building to Simon ben Jochai (second century after Christ); the synagogue at Irbid is even referred to the much more ancient Nittai of Arbela. See Carmoly, *Itinéraires de la Terre Sainte des xiii^e, xiv^e, xv^e, xvi^e, et xvii^e siècle, traduits de l'hebreu* (Bruxelles 1847), pp. 132, 136, 380 (Kefr Birim), pp. 262, 452 sq. (Gush Caleb=el-Djisch), pp. 133 sq., 184, 260 (Meiron), pp. 131, 259 (Arbel=Irbid). The date of the synagogue at Kasiun is decided by a Greek inscription of the time of Septimus Severus (A.D. 197) found among the ruins (Renan, p. 774). The style of the other synagogues being more or less akin to this, it is very probable, that they all belong to the flourishing period of Rabbinical Judaism in Galilee, i.e. to the second, third and fourth centuries after Christ. Renan tries to refer some even to the first century, especially the very well preserved one in Kefr Birim (p. 773). Pious imagination may therefore indulge in the thought, that the ruins at Tell Hum (=Capernaum) may possibly be those of the synagogue built by the Roman centurion, in which Jesus often taught (Wilson in *The Recovery*, p. 345. Guérin, *Galilée*, i. 229 sq. Bäder, 390). Almost all these synagogues lie north and south, so that the entrance is at the south. As a rule they appear to have had three doors in the front, one chief entrance and two smaller side doors (so in Kefr Birim, Meiron, Tell Hum). In some it is still discernible, that they were divided by two rows of columns into three aisles (as in Nabartein and Kasiun); the synagogue at Tell Hum had even five aisles. Some had a portico in front (as in Kefr Birim and Meiron). In general the architecture was influenced by the Graeco-Roman, while it yet very characteristically differed from it. It was especially distinguished by rich and superfluous ornamentation.

⁹⁰ *Jer. Sukka* v. 1, fol. 55ab; the same passage is also in Tosefta, *Sukka* 198, 20 sqq., ed. Zuckermann. Philo too mentions among the proseuchae of Alexandria a *μεγίστην καὶ περὶσημευτάτην* (*Leg. ad Caj.* § 20, Mang. ii. 565).

⁹¹ *Epiph. haer.* lxxx. 1.

their public prayers in the synagogue, but in an open space, perhaps also at the sea-shore.⁹² But this was done in quite open spaces, and does not prove the existence of unroofed buildings. Still more improbable is it, that just such buildings were called *προσευχαί* in a narrower sense, in distinction from the synagogues proper (as was after the precedent of others, admitted in the 1st edition of this work). For the testimony of Epiphanius, the supposed chief authority, by no means proves this.⁹³ The Acts of the Apostles seems rather to speak for a distinction between the terms *προσευχή* and

⁹² *Taanith* ii. 1: How is the order of the fast day solemnity? The ark (in which are the rolls of the law) is brought to the open space of the town, ashes of burnt wood are spread upon the ark and upon the heads of the prince and the chief of the court of justice, and every one else puts ashes on his own head. The eldest among those present, etc. . . (here follow further liturgical directions). Tertullian, *De jejuniis*, c. 16: *Judaicum certe jejunium ubique celebratur, cum omissis templis per omne litus quocunque in aperto aliquando jam precem ad caelum mittunt.* Id. *Ad nationes*, i. 13: *Judaici ritus luceanarum et jejunia cum azymis et orationes litorales.* Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 10. 23: *καὶ τὰς προσευχὰς ποιῆσθαι πρὸς τῇ θαλάσῃ κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἔθος.* Comp. also Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 14, Mang. ii. 535. Löw, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1884, p. 166 sq.

⁹³ Epiphanius, *haer.* lxxxi. (on the Messalians): *Τινὰς δὲ οἴκους ἑαυτοῖς κατασκευάσαντες ἢ τόπους πλατεῖς, φέρων δίκην, προσευχὰς ταύτας ἐκάλουν.* Καὶ ἦσαν μὲν τὸ παλαιὸν προσευχῶν τόποι ἐν τε τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἔξω πόλεως καὶ ἐν τοῖς Σαμαρείταις, ὡς καὶ ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων ἡρώμεν (here follows the quotation Acts xvi. 13). Ἀλλὰ καὶ προσευχῆς τόπος ἐν Σικίμοις, ἐν τῇ νυνὶ καλουμένῃ Νεαπόλει ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, ἐν τῇ πεδιάδι, ὡς ἀπὸ σημείων δύο, θεατροειδής, οὕτως ἐν ἀέρι καὶ αἰθρίῳ τόπῳ ἵστί κατασκευασθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν Σαμαριτῶν πάντα τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων μιμουμέναν. In explanation we remark (1) that what Epiphanius says of the heathen Messalians is of course not the rule for Jewish proceedings. And yet even they used the designation *προσευχή* for both kinds of places of prayer, the *οἶκοι* and the *τόποι πλατεῖς*. (2) Epiphanius certainly means to say by the learned remark which follows, that there were also among the Jews and Samaritans places of prayer under the open sky, called *προσευχαί*. He has however independent knowledge of this fact only among the Samaritans. With respect to the Jews he knows nothing more of it (comp. the praeterite ἦσαν τὸ παλαιόν), and only rests his assertion on Acts xvi. 13. And supposing he was in the right, this would not prove, that these places of prayer were called *proseuchae* in distinction from the synagogues.

συναγωγή, since here, chap. xvi. 13, 16, a προσευχή is spoken of at Philippi, and then directly after, chap. xvii. 1, ■ συναγωγή at Thessalonica. If however any distinction at all is to exist, it can only be, that the προσευχή was intended solely for prayer, the συναγωγή for other acts of worship also. But even this distinction is untenable in Acts xvi. 13, 16, since here the προσευχή is evidently the usual place of the Sabbath assembly, in which Paul also embraces the opportunity of preaching. And since, on the other hand, Philo in particular uses the word of the synagogue proper, no material distinction can be established between the two expressions.⁹⁴

Considering the value laid on these Sabbath assemblies, we must assume that there was in every town of Palestine, and even in smaller places, at least one synagogue.⁹⁵ In the post-Talmudic period it was required, that a synagogue should be built wherever but ten Israelites were dwelling together.⁹⁶ In the pre-Talmudic age indeed this requirement cannot be literally shown to have existed, though quite in agreement with its spirit. In the larger towns there was a considerable number of synagogues, as *e.g.* in Jerusalem,⁹⁷ Alex-

⁹⁴ Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-crit.* p. 320 (where too see other authorities for and against), also declares for the identity of the two.

⁹⁵ We find synagogues *e.g.* in Nazareth (Matt. xiii. 54; Mark vi. 2; Luke iv. 16), Capernaum (Mark i. 21; Luke vii. 5; John vi. 59). Comp. Acts xv. 21: κατὰ πόλιν. Philo, *De Septenario*, c. 6 (Mang. ii. 282 = Tischendorf, *Philonea*, p. 23): Ἀναπέπταται γοῦν ταῖς ἐβδόμοις μυρία κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν διδασκαλεῖα φρονήσεως καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν.

⁹⁶ Maimonides, *Hilchoth Tephilla* xi. 1. See Vitranga, *De Synagoga*, pp. 232–239. That at least ten persons form an assembly for public worship is already said in the Mishna. See *Megilla* iv. 3; *Sanhedrin* i. 6. Comp. also *Megilla* i. 3. With respect to the Passover, Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 9, 3.

⁹⁷ Acts vi. 9, xxiv. 12. A synagogue of Alexandrines in Jerusalem, also in Tossefta, *Megilla* iii., ed. Zuckermann, p. 224. 16; *Jer. Megilla* 73^d (in Lightfoot, *Horae* on Acts vi. 9). The Talmudic myth, that there were 480 synagogues in Jerusalem, is indeed simply characteristic of the insipidity of these legends.

andria,⁹⁸ Rome.⁹⁹ The different synagogues of one and the same town seem to have been sometimes distinguished from each other by special emblems. Thus there was in Sepphoris a "synagogue of the vine" (בְּנֵי־שֵׁתָא דְּוִנְפָּנָא),¹⁰⁰ in Rome a synagogue of the olive tree (συναγωγὴ ἐλαίας).¹⁰¹

The fittings of the synagogues were in New Testament times very simple. The chief was the closet (תִּכְיָה) in which were kept the rolls of the law and the other sacred books.¹⁰² These were wrapped in linen cloths (תְּהִיבָהּ),¹⁰³ and lay in a case (רִיָּה=θήκη).¹⁰⁴ An elevated place (בֵּימָה =

⁹⁸ Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* c. 20 (Mang. ii. 565): πολλὰ καὶ εἰς καθ' ἑκάστην τμήμα τῆς πόλεως.

⁹⁹ Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* c. 23 (Mang. ii. 568), speaks of προσευχαί in Rome in the plural. For farther particulars concerning the Roman synagogues, see below, § 31.

¹⁰⁰ *Jer. Nasir* vii. 1, fol. 56^a. Lightfoot mistakenly translates "synagogue of the Gophnites" (*Horae Hebr., Centuria Matthaeo praemissa*, c. 55; *Opp.* ii. 211).

¹⁰¹ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9904. De Rossi, *Bulletino*, v. 1867, p. 16. I formerly felt great hesitation as to the meaning of the expression (see my *Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom*, p. 17), but now consider the above explanation undoubtedly correct.

¹⁰² The תִּכְיָה is mentioned: *Megilla* iii. 1; *Nedarim* v. 5; *Taanith* ii. 1-2 (according to the latter passage it was transportable); also in the frequently recurring formula, עֲבַר לְפָנֵי הַתִּכְיָה (see below on Public Worship). Chrysost. *Orat. adv. Judaeos*, vi. 7 (*Opp.* ed. Montf. vol. i.): "Ἄλλως δὲ, ποία κιβωτὸς νῦν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις, ὅπου ἱλαστήριον οὐκ ἔστιν; ὅπου οὐ χρησμὸς, οὐ διαθήκης πλάκες. . . Ἐμοὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τῆς ἀγορᾶς πωλουμένων κιβωτίων οὐδὲν ἀμεινον αὕτη ἢ κιβωτὸς διακεῖσθαι δοκεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλῷ χαῖρον. See on the whole subject, Vitringa, pp. 174-182. On the keeping of the sacred books in the synagogue, see Josephus, *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2. Chrysost. *Orat. adv. Judaeos*, i. 5: 'Ἐπειδὴ δὲ εἰσὶ τινες, οἱ καὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν σεμνὸν εἶναι τόπον νομίζουσιν, ἀναγκαῖον καὶ πρὸς τούτους ὀλίγα εἰπεῖν. . . Ὁ νόμος ἀπόκειται, φησὶν, ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ βιβλία προφητικά. Καὶ τί τοῦτο; Μὴ γάρ, ἐνθα ἂν ἡ βιβλία τοιαῦτα, καὶ ὁ τόπος ἅγιος ἔσται; Οὐ πάντως. Similarly *Orat.* vi. 6 and 7. Maimonides, *Hilchoth Tephilla* xi. 3, in Vitringa, p. 182, and Bartenora on *Taanith* ii. 1 (Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. 361), expressly say, that the sacred books were kept in the תִּכְיָה.

¹⁰³ *Kilajim* ix. 3; *Shabbath* ix. 6; *Megilla* iii. 1; *Kelim* xxviii. 4; *Negaim* xi. 11.

¹⁰⁴ *Shabbath* xvi. 1. The word תִּיָּה is also in *Kelim* xvi. 7-8. On the

βῆμα, tribune), upon which stood the reading-desk, was erected, at least in post-Talmudic times, for him who read the Scriptures aloud or preached.¹⁰⁵ Both are mentioned in the Jerusalem Talmud,¹⁰⁶ and may well be assumed for the time of Christ. Among other fittings, lamps may also be mentioned.¹⁰⁷ Lastly trombones (שופרות) and trumpets (חצוצרות) were indispensable instruments in public worship. The former were blown especially on the first day of the year, the latter on the feast days.¹⁰⁸

The order of divine worship was in New Testament times already tolerably developed and established. The congregation sat in an appointed order, the most distinguished members in the front seats, the younger behind; men and women probably apart.¹⁰⁹ In the great synagogue at Alexandria the

use of book-cases in classical antiquity, see Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen* (1882), pp. 64–66. Many expositors insist on understanding the *φελόνης* of 1 Tim. iv. 13 as such a book-case. A representation of an old silver case for the Pentateuch among the modern Samaritans is given in *The Survey of Western Palestine*, etc., vol. ii. 1882, p. 206.

¹⁰⁵ Maimonides, *Hilchoth Tephilla* xi. 3; Vitringa, pp. 182–190.

¹⁰⁶ *Jer. Megilla* iii. 1, fol. 73a, below. The reading-desk is here called אנלן = *αναλογεῖον*. For so must we read with *Aruch*, instead of אנלן, as given in the editions. The same word also in *Kelim* xvi. 7, 8. See Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* s.v.

¹⁰⁷ *Terumoth* xi. 10; *Pesachim* iv. 4; Vitringa, pp. 194–199.

¹⁰⁸ *Rosh hashana* iii. 3, 4, 7, and generally iii.–iv.; *Taanith* ii.–iii. Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. 341. Vitringa, pp. 203–211 (and at p. 209, also many passages from Chrysostom). Winer, *RWB.*, art. "Musikalische Instrumente." Gesenius' *Thesaurus*, pp. 513, 1469. Leyrer, art. "Musik," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* According to *Jer. Shabbath* xvii. fol. 16, *Bab. Shabbath* 35^b, the dawn of the Sabbath was also announced by the blowing of instruments (see the passages in Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterbuch*, s.v. חצוצרת; Vitringa, p. 1123 sq.). Whether this was general in former times (for which *Chullin* i. *fin.* speaks), or only took place in the temple at Jerusalem (which is at all events evidenced by Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 12; *Sukka* v. 5), must here be left undecided.

¹⁰⁹ On the *πρωτοκαθεδρία* of the scribes and Pharisees, see Matt. xxiii. 6; Mark xii. 39; Luke xi. 43, xx. 46. Philo says at least of the Essenes, that the order was according to age, the younger sitting "below" (i.e. behind) the elder, *Quod omnis probus liber*, c. 12 (*Mang.* ii. 458): καὶ ἡλικίας ἐν

men are said to have sat apart according to their respective trades (תקנות).¹¹⁰ If there was a leper in the community a special division was prepared for him. So at least the Mishna required.¹¹¹ Ten individuals were necessary to form a regular assembly for public worship (see above, vol. ii. p. 67). The chief parts of the service were, according to the Mishna, the recitation of the *Shema*, *prayer*, *the reading of the Thorah*, *the reading of the prophets*, *the blessing of the priest*.¹¹² To these were added the *translation* of the portions of Scripture read, which is assumed in the Mishna (see below), and the explanation of what had been read by an edifying *discourse*, which in Philo figures as the chief matter in the whole service.¹¹³

ράξειςιν ὑπὸ πρεσβυτέροις νέοι καθίζοντι. The separation of the sexes must be assumed as self-evident, although it does not happen to be mentioned in any of the more ancient authorities. For what is said in Pseudo-Philo, *De vita contemplativa*, c. 9, init. (Mang. ii. 482), of the Therapeutae cannot be here taken into account. Nor is a special division for women mentioned in the Talmud; see Löw, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1884, p. 364 sqq., especially 371.

¹¹⁰ Jer. *Sukka* v. 1, fol. 55ab.

¹¹¹ *Negaim* xiii. 12.

¹¹² The enumeration of these parts, *Megilla* iv. 8.

¹¹³ We have three summary descriptions of the public worship of the synagogue in Philo: 1. *Fragm. apud Euseb. Praep. evang.* viii. 7. 12-13, ed. Gaisf. (Mang. ii. 630), from the first book of the *Hypothetica*: Τί οὖν ἐποίησε [scil. ὁ νομοθέτης] ταῖς ἐβδόμαις ταύταις ἡμέραις; Αὐτοὺς εἰς ταυτὸν ἡξίου συνάγεσθαι, καὶ καθεζομένους μετ' ἀλλήλων σὺν αἰδοὶ καὶ κόσμῳ τῶν νόμων ἀκροᾶσθαι τοῦ μηδὲνα ἀγνοῆσαι χάριν. Καὶ δῆτα συνέρχονται μὲν αἰεὶ, καὶ συνεδρεοῦνσι μετ' ἀλλήλων· οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ σιωπῇ, πλὴν εἴ τι προσεπιφημίσαι τοῖς ἀναγινωσκομένοις νομίζεται· τῶν ἱερέων δὲ τις ὁ παρὼν ἢ τῶν γερόντων εἰς ἀναγινώσκει τοὺς ἱεροὺς νόμους αὐτοῖς, καὶ καθ' ἑκάστον ἐξηγεῖται μέχρι σχεδὸν δέλης ὥφιας. 2. *De Septenario*, c. 6 (Mang. ii. 282 = Tischendorf, *Philonea*, p. 23): Ἀναπέπταται γοῦν ταῖς ἐβδόμαις μυρία κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν διδασκαλεῖα φρονήσεως καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν. Ἐν οἷς οἱ μὲν ἐν κόσμῳ καθίζονται, σὺν ἡσυχίᾳ τὰ ὅσα ἀνθρωπότης, μετὰ προσεχῆς πάσης, ἔνεκα τοῦ διψῆν λόγων ποτίμω. Ἀναστὰς δὲ τις τῶν ἐμπειροτάτων ὑφηγεῖται τᾶριστα καὶ συνοῖσιντα, οἷς ἅπας ὁ βίος ἐπιδάσει πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον. 3. Of the Essenes, *Quod omnis probus liber*, c. 12 (Mang. ii. 458, also in Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* viii. 12. 10, ed. Gaisf.): Ὁ μὲν τὰς βίβλους ἀναγινώσκει λαβὼν, ἕτερος δὲ τῶν ἐμπειροτάτων, ὅσα μὴ γνώριμα

The Shema, so called from its commencing words, שְׁמָע יִשְׂרָאֵל, consists of the sections Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-21, Num. xv. 37-41, together with certain benedictions before and after (see particulars in Appendix). It was always distinguished from prayer proper, and is rather a *confession of faith* than a prayer. Hence the "reciting" not the "praying" of the Shema is spoken of (קריאת שמע). As the Shema undoubtedly belongs to the times of Christ, it is evident that certain established prayers were then already customary in public worship. It can however hardly be ascertained, how much of the somewhat copiously developed liturgy of post-Talmudic Judaism reaches back to that period.¹¹⁴ The formula by which the reader summoned to prayer, בְּרַכּוֹ אָתָּה יְיָהוּה, is expressly mentioned in the Mishna.¹¹⁵ The custom too of praying the three first and three last benedictions of the Shemoneh Esreh (of which particulars are given in the Appendix) at Sabbath and festival worship, reaches back to the age of the Mishna.¹¹⁶ It was the custom to pray stand-

παραθῶν ἀναδιδάσκει. I here further mention, that in the post-Talmudic period, especially in the treatise *Soferim*, c. 10-21 (best edition: *Masechet Soferim*, edited by Joel Müller, 1878), there is a series of detailed directions for the synagogue worship. Vitringa, *De synagoga*, pp. 946-1121, following Maimonides, gives an exhaustive description of the ritual of the post-Talmudic period; comp. also pp. 667-711. The works of Jewish scholars, of which 100 are recorded by Strack in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. xv., and chiefly among these Zunz, *Die ritus des synagogalen Gottesdienstes entwickelt*, Berlin 1859, may also be consulted for the history of the synagogue ritual in the post-Talmudic period.

¹¹⁴ For a description of it, according to Maimonides, see Vitringa, *De synagoga*, pp. 1075-1090, in general, pp. 1022-1113. Every orthodox Jewish prayer-book also gives information on the subject. On the details, see especially in Hamburger's *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii., the articles "Abendgebet," "Kaddisch," "Keduscha," "Kiddusch," "Minchagebet," "Morgengebet," "Mussafgebet," "Schema," "Schemone-Esre." The so-called Kaddisch is especially interesting on account of its points of contact with the Lord's Prayer. See Hamburger as above, ii. p. 603 sqq.

¹¹⁵ *Berachoth* vii. 3.

¹¹⁶ Comp. on the general subject, Vitringa, p. 1024 sq. (after Maimo-

ing and with the face turned towards the Holy of Holies, *i.e.* towards Jerusalem.¹¹⁷ The prayer was not uttered by the whole congregation, but by some one called upon for this office (the *שליח צבור*) by the ruler of the synagogue, the congregation making only certain responses, especially the *אמן*.¹¹⁸ He who pronounced the prayer stepped in front of the chest in which lay the rolls of the law. Hence *עבר לפני התיבה*

nides). Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge*, p. 367. That the custom reaches back to the period of the Mishna is evident from *Rosh hashana* iv. 5.

¹¹⁷ On standing at prayer, see Matt. vi. 5; Mark xi. 25; Luke xviii. 11; *Berachoth* v. 1; *Taanith* ii. 2. Lightfoot (*Horae Hebr.*) and Wetzstein (*Nov. Test.*) on Matt. vi. 5. On turning towards the Holy of Holies, *viz.* towards Jerusalem, Ezek. viii. 16; 1 Kings viii. 48; Dan. vi. 11; *Berachoth* iv. 5-6; *Sifre* 71^b, ed. Friedmann in Weber, *System der altsynag. Theol.* p. 62. The same passage also in Tosefta, *Berachoth* iii. p. 8, ed. Zuckermann (comp. also Löw, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1884, p. 310). It is striking that the still remaining ruins of ancient synagogues in Galilee have almost all the entrance towards the south (see above, note 89^a). According to this it would be supposed that the Holy Land lay to the north, and that the congregation sat or stood facing the north. Or was it that the turning towards Jerusalem, *i.e.* towards the south, was required from the reader only? In after times, when the synagogues were regarded as an exchange for the temple, we meet with the direction to have the entrance as in the temple at the east (Tosefta, *Megilla* iv. p. 227, 15th ed. Zuckermann). It seems, however, that this direction was never complied with. In the European congregations of the Middle Ages, it was the rule to place the entrance at the west, so that the worshippers might turn to the east. For further particulars, see Löw, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1884, p. 305 sqq. Comp. on the subject generally, Winer, *RWB.*, art. "Gebet." Hölemann, *Die biblische Gestalt der Anbetung*, in *Bibelstudien*, i. 96-153.

¹¹⁸ On the summons to deliver the prayer by the archisynagogus, see above, vol. ii. p. 65; on *שליח צבור*, p. 67. The responsive *אמן* is already found in the Old Testament, Deut. xxvii. 15 sqq.; Neh. viii. 6; 1 Chron. xvi. 36; Tob. viii. 8. See also *Berachoth* viii. 8; *Taanith* ii. 5. Also in Christian worship from the first, 1 Cor. xiv. 16. Justin, *Apol. maj.* 65, 67. See generally, Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. s.v.* Vitranga, *De synagoga*, p. 1093 sqq. Wetzstein and other expositors on 1 Cor. xiv. 46; Suicer, *Thes. s.v.* ἀμὴν. Otto's note on Justin, c. 65. Older literature in Wolf, *Curae philol. in Nov. Test.* on Matt. vi. 13 and 1 Cor. xiv. 16.

is the usual expression for "to lead in prayer."¹¹⁹ Every adult member of the congregation was competent to do this.¹²⁰ The same individual, who said the prayer, might also recite the Shema, read the lesson from the prophets and, if he were a priest, pronounce the blessing.¹²¹

The *Scripture lessons* (from both the Pentateuch and the prophets) might also be read by any member of the congregation, and even by minors.¹²² The latter were only excluded from reading the Book of Esther at the feast of Purim.¹²³ If *priests* and Levites were present, they took precedence in reading the lesson.¹²⁴ It was customary for the reader to stand (Luke iv. 16 : ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι).¹²⁵ Both sitting and standing were allowed at the reading of the Book of Esther,¹²⁶ and the king was also allowed to sit when he read his portion of Scripture at the feast of Tabernacles in the Sabbatic year.¹²⁷ The lesson from the Thorah was so arranged that the whole Pentateuch consecutively was got through in a cycle of three

¹¹⁹ *Berachoth* v. 3-4; *Erubin* iii. 9; *Rosh hashana* iv. 7; *Taanith* i. 2, ii. 5; *Megilla* iv. 3, 5, 6, 8. Comp. also *Taanith* ii. 2.

¹²⁰ *Megilla* iv. 6. In Christian congregations also the prayer was said by some member of them, see 1 Cor. xi. 4.

¹²¹ *Megilla* iv. 5.

¹²² *Megilla* iv. 5-6. That the reading of the Scripture lesson was not the work of a permanent official is evident from Philo, *Fragm. ap. Euseb. Praep. evang.* viii. 7. 13 (see above, vol. ii. p. 76).

¹²³ *Megilla* ii. 4.

¹²⁴ *Gittin* v. 8: "The following things have been ordained for the sake of peace. The priest is the first to read, then the Levite, then the Israelite for the sake of peace." Maimonides testifies that it was the custom in his time to give an unlearned priest precedence in reading over a learned Israelite, a proceeding which indeed he does not approve. See Maimonides, *Commentary on Gittin* v. 8 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, iii. 341), and *Hilchoth Tephilla* xii. 18 (in Vitringa, p. 981). Comp. also Hamburger, *Real-Enc. ii.* 1267. Philo too points out the precedence of the priests; only he assumes therewith that there would be but one to read the lesson, *Fragm. ap. Euseb. Praep. evang.* viii. 7. 13: τῶν ἱερέων δὲ τις ὁ παρὼν ἢ τῶν γερόντων εἰς.

¹²⁵ Comp. *Joma* vii. 1; *Sota* vii. 7 (vol. ii. p. 64 sq.). Lightfoot on Luke iv. 16.

¹²⁶ *Megilla* iv. 1.

¹²⁷ *Sota* vii. 8.

years,¹²⁸ for which purpose it was divided into 154 sections (פְּרָשִׁיִּים).¹²⁹ On Sabbaths several members of the congregation, at the least seven, who were summoned for the purpose by some official, originally indeed by the ruler of the synagogue, took part in the reading.¹³⁰ The first and the last of these had to pronounce a thanksgiving (בְּרָכָה) at the beginning and at the end.¹³¹ Each had (at the reading of the Thorah) to read at least *three* verses,¹³² and might never repeat them by heart.¹³³ Such at least was the order prescribed by the Mishna, which certainly was observed only in the synagogues of Palestine. The Talmud expressly remarks of non-Hebraist Jews, that among them the whole Parashah was always read by one;^{133a} and with this agrees Philo, who evidently assumes that the lesson from the Thorah was read by one person (see

¹²⁸ *Megilla* 29b.

¹²⁹ See Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge*, p. 3 sq. Hupfeld, *Stud. und Krit.* 1837, p. 830 sq. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 209–215. Grätz, *Ueber Entwicklung der Pentateuch-Perikopen-Vorlesung* (*Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenth.* 1869, pp. 385–399). Hamburger, *Real-Enc. f. Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. art. "Vorlesung aus der Thora." The present custom of reading the Pentateuch in fifty-four sections in *one* year is of later origin.

¹³⁰ On the summons to the Thorah, see Vitringa, pp. 980, 1122 (after Maimonides). According to Maimonides this was certainly done by the *Chassan*. But he had in the post-Talmudic period an entirely different position from that which he formerly occupied. That it was originally done by the archisynagogus may be admitted as probable from his position in other respects. Rashi and Bartenora at least testify (in the passages named above, vol. ii. p. 65) that the archisynagogus (*Rosh ha-keneseth*) had to determine who was to read the lesson from the prophets, the Shema, and the prayer.

¹³¹ *Megilla* iv. 2. Maimonides in Vitringa, p. 983.

¹³² *Megilla* iv. 4.

¹³³ Zunz, p. 5. *Comp. Megilla* ii. 1 (with respect to the Book of Esther). *Taanith* iv. 3 (where reciting by heart is mentioned as an exception).

^{133a} *Jer. Megilla* iv. 3, fol. 75a (on the direction of the Mishna that on the Sabbath seven persons should always be called upon to read the Thorah). "The foreign-speaking Jews (הַלְעָוִיתִים) have not this custom, but one person reads the whole Parashah." See the passage in Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. 59, note, and in Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* ii. 515a, s.v. לֵךְ.

the passages, vol. ii. p. 76). The reading of the law was already followed in New Testament times by a *paragraph from the prophets* (i.e. the **נְבִיאִים**, which include the older historical books), as we see from Luke iv. 17, where Jesus reads a section from Isaiah, and from Acts xiii. 15 : *ἀνάγνωσις τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν*. These lessons from the prophets are mentioned also in the Mishna.¹⁸⁴ As these formed the conclusion of the reading from the Scriptures, it was called **הַפְּתִיר בְּנְבִיא** (to close with the prophet), on which account the prophetic paragraphs were called Haphtaroth. For these no *lectio continua* was required ;¹⁸⁵ hence a choice of them was open,¹⁸⁶ and they were always read by one person.¹⁸⁷ They were moreover only read at the chief services on the Sabbath, and not also at week-day and Sabbath afternoon services.¹⁸⁸

The sacred language in which the sections of Scripture were read aloud being no longer familiar to the bulk of the people, it was necessary to ensure their better understanding by *translation*. Hence the reading was accompanied by a continuous translation into the Aramaic dialect. Whether the translator (**מְתוּרְמָן**) was a permanent official, or whether any competent members of the congregation officiated by turns as interpreters, must, in the absence of more definite evidence, be here left uncertain. In the lesson from the Thorah the reader had to read one verse at a time for the translator, in the lesson from the prophets three, unless one verse formed a separate paragraph, when he was then to read it also alone.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁴ *Megilla* iv. 1-5. Further particulars in Vitranga, p. 984 sqq. Herzfeld, iii. 215 sqq. Adler, *Die Haftara* (*Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenth.* 1862, pp. 222-228). Hamburger, *Real-Enc. f. Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. art. "Haftara."

¹⁸⁵ *Megilla* iv. 4.

¹⁸⁶ Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 336. Comp. Luke iv. 17 sqq.

¹⁸⁷ *Megilla* iv. 5.

¹⁸⁸ *Megilla* iv. 1-2. Of the Kethubim only the five Megilloth were used, and these only on particular occasions in the year, in the synagogue service ; see Kisch, *Monatsschr.* 1880, p. 543 sqq.

¹⁸⁹ Comp. *Megilla* iv. 4, 6, 10. Vitranga, *De synagoga*, pp. 1015-1022.

The reading of the Scriptures was followed by an edifying lecture or sermon (הַדְרָשָׁה), by which the portion which had been read was explained and applied. That such explanations were the general practice is evident from the διδάσκειν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς,¹⁴⁰ so frequently mentioned in the New Testament, from Luke iv. 20 sqq., and from the express testimony of Philo (see above, p. 76). The preacher (דְּרַשָׁן)¹⁴¹ used to sit (Luke iv. 20: ἐκάθισεν) on an elevated place.¹⁴² Nor was such preaching confined to appointed persons, but, as appears especially from Philo, open to any competent member of the congregation.^{142a} The service closed with the blessing, pronounced by a priestly member of the congregation, to which the whole congregation responded (אָמֵן).¹⁴³ If no

Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge*, p. 8. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, Div. ii. art. "Targum." The like is also incidentally testified of Christian congregations. Thus in Scythopolis, in the time of Diocletian, the Scriptures were read in Greek, but translated by an interpreter into Aramaic. See the Syriac text of Euseb. *De mart. Palaest.* in Zahn, *Tatian's Diatessaron* (1881), p. 19.

¹⁴⁰ Matt. iv. 23; Mark i. 21, vi. 2; Luke iv. 15, vi. 6, xiii. 10; John vi. 59, xviii. 20.

¹⁴¹ Ben Soma was a celebrated דְּרַשָׁן (*Sota* ix. 15).

¹⁴² Comp. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge*, p. 337. Delitzsch, *Ein Tag in Capernaum*, p. 127 sq.

^{142a} See Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, Div. ii. art. "Predigt."

¹⁴³ *Berachoth* v. 4. *Megilla* iv. 3, 5, 6, 7. On the *Blessing ritual*, see *Sota* vii. 6 (= *Tamid* vii. 2): "How is the priestly blessing pronounced? In the country in three sentences, in the temple in one. In the temple the name of God is pronounced as written (יהוה), in the country according to its appellation (אֱדֹנָי). In the country the priests raise their hands only as high as the shoulder, in the temple above the head, with the exception of the high priest, who must not raise his hands above the plate of the mitre. R. Judah says: He also raised his hands above the plate of the mitre." According to *Rosh hashana* 31^b, *Sota* 40^b, Johanan ben Sakkai is said to have ordered that after the destruction of the temple the priests should only pronounce the blessing barefooted (Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, p. 305, n. 3). On the whole subject, see Wagenseil on *Sota* vii. 6 (Surenhusius' *Mishna*, iii. 264 sq.). Vitringa, pp. 1114–1121. Lundius, *Die alten jüdischen Heiligthümer*, b. iii. c. 48. Haener, *De ritu benedictionis sacerdotalis*, Jenæ 1671 (also in *Thesaurus theol. philologicus*, Amst. 1701–1702,

priest were present, the blessing was not pronounced, but made into a prayer.¹⁴⁴

The order above described is that of the principal service on the forenoon of the Sabbath. The congregation assembled also on the Sabbath afternoon at the time of the Minchah offering. When then Philo says, that the Sabbath assemblies lasted *μέχρι σχεδὸν δειλῆς ὀψίας* (see above, p. 76), this is not without foundation considering the length of these services. At the afternoon service no lesson from the prophets, but only one from the Pentateuch, was read. And only *three* members of the congregation, neither more nor less, took part in the reading.¹⁴⁵ The same order was also observed at week-day services, which were regularly held on the second and fifth week-days (Mondays and Fridays).¹⁴⁶ There was also a meeting for the reading of the Thorah, in which *four* members of the congregation shared in the Parashah.¹⁴⁷ Nor was there any festival in the year, which was not distinguished by public worship and reading from the law; and the Mishna prescribed lessons from the Pentateuch for every festival.¹⁴⁸

APPENDIX.

The Shema and the Shemoneh Esreh.

The Shema and the Shemoneh Esreh occupy, on the one hand from their antiquity, on the other from the high estimation in which they were held, so prominent a position in the Jewish liturgy, that further particulars concerning them must here be given.

vol. ii. p. 936 sq.). Hottinger, *De benedictione sacerdotali*, Marburg 1709 (also in *Thesaurus novus theol.-phil.*, ed. Hasaeus et Ikenius, vol. i. p. 393 sqq.). Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 1265, art. "Priestersegen."

¹⁴⁴ Vitranga, p. 1120 (after Maimonides).

¹⁴⁵ *Megilla* iii. 6, iv. 1.

¹⁴⁶ *Megilla* iii. 6, iv. 1. Comp. i. 2, 3.

¹⁴⁷ *Megilla* iv. 2.

¹⁴⁸ *Megilla* iii. 5-6. Comp. Herzfeld, iii. 213. Hamburger, ii. 1265 sq. (art. "Vorlesung aus der Thora").

1. *The Shema*¹⁴⁹ consists of the three paragraphs, Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-21, and Num. xv. 37-41; therefore of those passages of the Pentateuch, in which is chiefly inculcated that Jehovah alone is the God of Israel, and in which the use of certain mementos is prescribed for the constant remembrance of Him. The three paragraphs are expressly named in the Mishna by the words with which they begin: (1) שְׁמַע, (2) וְיָהוָה אֶחָד, and (3) וְיִאמָר.¹⁵⁰ Around this nucleus are grouped at the beginning and end thanksgivings (Berachahs); and the Mishna prescribes that *two* benedictions should be said before, and *one* after, the morning Shema, and *two* before, and *two* after, the evening Shema.¹⁵¹ The initial words of the concluding benediction are cited in the Mishna just as they are used to this day, viz. אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ יְחִיד.¹⁵² If then the wording of the benedictions was subsequently considerably increased, they still belong fundamentally to the period of the Mishna.¹⁵³ This prayer, or more correctly this *confession of faith*, was to be said twice a day, viz. morning and evening, by every adult male Israelite;¹⁵⁴ women, slaves and children were not required to repeat it.¹⁵⁵ It was not necessary that it should be recited in Hebrew, any other language being admissible for the purpose.¹⁵⁶ How ancient this custom of repeating the Shema was, appears from the fact that the Mishna already gives such detailed directions concerning it.^{156a} It mentions moreover that it was already repeated by the priests in the temple, which assumes the use of it at least before A.D. 70.¹⁵⁷ Nay,

¹⁴⁹ See Vitringa, *De synagoga*, pp. 1052-1061. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge*, pp. 367, 369-371. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 1087-1092.

¹⁵⁰ *Berachoth* ii. 2; *Tamid* v. 1.

¹⁵¹ *Berachoth* i. 4.

¹⁵² *Berachoth* ii. 2; *Tamid* v. 1.

¹⁵³ Zunz (as above) has attempted to separate the ancient portions from the modern additions.

¹⁵⁴ *Berachoth* i. 1-4.

¹⁵⁵ *Berachoth* iii. 3.

¹⁵⁶ *Sota* vii. 1.

^{156a} Comp. in general also, *Pesachim* iv. 8; *Taanith* iv. 3; *Sota* v. 4; *Aboth* ii. 13.

¹⁵⁷ *Tamid* iv. *fin.*, v. 1.

for Josephus the origin of this custom is lost in so hoar an antiquity, that he regards it as an enactment of Moses himself.¹⁵⁸

2. *The Shemoneh Esreh.*¹⁵⁹ Somewhat more recent than the Shema, but still very ancient as to its groundwork, is the Shemoneh Esreh, *i.e.* the chief prayer, which every Israelite, even women, slaves and children, had to repeat three times a day, viz. morning, afternoon (at the time of the Minchah offering) and evening.¹⁶⁰ It is so much the chief prayer of the Israelite, that it is also called merely *הַתְּפִלָּה*, "the prayer." In its final, authentic and fixed form it does not consist, as its name *שְׁמוֹנֶה עָשָׂר* denotes, of eighteen, but of nineteen Berachahs. Its words, as given in every Jewish prayer-book, are as follow:—

"1. Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God and the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the great God, the mighty and tremendous, the Most High God, who bestowest gracious favours and createst all things, and rememberest the piety of the patriarchs, and wilt bring a redeemer to their posterity, for the sake of Thy name in love. O King, who bringest help and healing and art a shield. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the shield of Abraham. 2. Thou art mighty for ever, O Lord; Thou restorest life to the dead, Thou art mighty to save; who sustainest the living with beneficence, quickenest the dead with great mercy, supporting the fallen and healing the sick, and setting at liberty

¹⁵⁸ Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 8. 13: *Δις δ' ἐκάστης ἡμέρας, ἀρχομένης τε αὐτῆς καὶ ὅποτε πρὸς ὕπνου ὥρα τρέπεσθαι, μαρτυρεῖν τῷ θεῷ τὰς δαρεὰς ὡς ἀπαλλαγεῖσιν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῆς Αἰγυπτίων γῆς παρέσχε, δικαίας οὕσης φύσει τῆς εὐχαριστίας καὶ γενομένης ἐπ' ἀμοιβῇ μὲν τῶν ἡδὴ γεγονότων ἐπὶ δὲ προτροπῇ τῶν ἰσομένων.* That Josephus means by this the custom of reciting the Shema cannot be doubtful. He rightly views the Shema as a thankful confession of Jehovah, as the God who redeemed Israel from Egypt. Comp. especially, Num. xv. 41.

¹⁵⁹ See Vitringa, *De synagoga*, pp. 1031–1051. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge*, pp. 367–369. Delitzsch, *Zur Gesch. der jüdischen Poesie* (1836), pp. 191–193. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 200–204. Bickell, *Messe und Pashah* (1872), pp. 65 sq., 71–73. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 1092–1099.

¹⁶⁰ *Berachoth* iii. 3 (women, children, slaves), iv. 1 (three times a day).

those who are bound, and upholding Thy faithfulness unto those who sleep in the dust. Who is like unto Thee, Lord, the Almighty One ; or who can be compared unto Thee, O King, who killest and makest alive again, and causest help to spring forth ? And faithful art Thou to quicken the dead. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who restorest the dead. 3. Thou art holy and Thy name is holy, and the saints daily praise Thee. Selah. Blessed art Thou, O Lord ; the God most holy. 4. Thou graciously impartest to man knowledge, and teachest to mortals reason. Let us be favoured from Thee with knowledge, understanding and wisdom. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who graciously impartest knowledge. 5. Cause us to turn, O our Father, to Thy law, and draw us near, O our King, to Thy service, and restore us in perfect repentance to Thy presence. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who delightest in repentance. 6. Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned ; pardon us, our King, for we have transgressed ; ready to pardon and forgive Thou art. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, most gracious, who dost abundantly pardon. 7. Look, we beseech Thee, upon our afflictions, and plead our cause and redeem us speedily for the sake of Thy name, for a mighty Redeemer Thou art. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the Redeemer of Israel. 8. Heal us, O Lord, and we shall be healed ; save us, and we shall be saved ; for our praise art Thou ; and bring forth a perfect remedy unto all our infirmities ; for a God and King, a faithful healer, and most merciful art Thou. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who healest the diseases of Thy people Israel. 9. Bless unto us, O Lord our God, this year and grant us an abundant harvest, and bring a blessing on our land, and satisfy us with Thy goodness ; and bless our year as the good years. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who blessest the years. 10. Sound with the great trumpet to announce our freedom ; and set up a standard to collect our captives, and gather us together from the four corners of the earth. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who gatherest the outcasts of Thy people Israel. 11. O restore our judges as formerly, and our counsellors as at the beginning ; and remove from us sorrow and sighing ; and reign over us, Thou O Lord alone, in grace and mercy ; and justify us. Blessed art Thou, O Lord the King, for Thou lovest Righteousness and justice. 12. To slanderers let there be no hope, and let all workers of wickedness perish as in a moment ; and let all of them speedily be cut off ; and humble them speedily in our days. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who destroyest enemies and humblest tyrants. 13. Upon the just and upon the pious and upon the elders of Thy people the house of Israel, and upon the remnant of their scribes, and upon righteous strangers, and upon us, bestow, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy, O Lord our God, and grant a good reward unto all who confide in Thy

name faithfully ; and appoint our portion with them for ever, and may we never be put to shame, for our trust is in Thee. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the support and confidence of the righteous. 14. And to Jerusalem Thy city return with compassion, and dwell therein as Thou hast promised ; and rebuild her speedily in our days, a structure everlasting ; and the throne of David speedily establish therein. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the builder of Jerusalem. 15. The offspring of David Thy servant speedily cause to flourish, and let his horn be exalted in Thy salvation ; for Thy salvation do we hope daily. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who causest the horn of salvation to flourish. 16. Hear our voice, O Lord our God, pity and have mercy upon us, and accept with compassion and favour these our prayers, for Thou art a God who heareth prayers and supplications ; and from Thy presence, O our King, send us not empty away, for Thou hearest the prayers of Thy people Israel in mercy. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer. 17. Be pleased, O Lord our God, with Thy people Israel, and with their prayers ; and restore the sacrificial service to the Holy of Holies of Thy house ; and the offerings of Israel, and their prayers in love do Thou accept with favour ; and may the worship of Israel Thy people be ever pleasing. O that our eyes may behold Thy return to Zion with mercy. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who restorest Thy glory (שְׁבִינָה) unto Zion. 18. We praise Thee, for Thou art the Lord our God and the God of our fathers for ever and ever ; the Rock of our life, the Shield of our salvation, Thou art for ever and ever. We will render thanks unto Thee, and declare Thy praise, for our lives which are delivered into Thy hand, and for our souls which are deposited with Thee, and for Thy miracles which daily are with us ; and for Thy wonders and Thy goodness, which are at all times, evening and morning and at noon. Thou art good for Thy mercies fail not, and compassionate for Thy loving-kindness never ceaseth ; our hopes are for ever in Thee. And for all this praised and extolled be Thy name, our King, for ever and ever. And all that live shall give thanks unto Thee for ever, Selah, and shall praise Thy name in truth ; the God of our salvation and our aid for ever. Selah. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, for all-bountiful is Thy name, and unto Thee it becometh us to give thanks. 19. Great salvation bring over Israel Thy people for ever, for Thou art King, Lord of all salvation. Praised be Thou, Lord, for Thou blessest Thy people Israel with salvation."

From the contents of this prayer it is evident, that it first attained its finally authentic form after the destruction of Jerusalem, that is, after A.D. 70. For it presupposes in its

14th and 17th Berachah the destruction of the city and the cessation of the sacrificial service. On the other hand, it is already cited in the Mishna under the name שְׁמוֹנֶה עָשָׂר,¹⁶¹ and it is mentioned, that R. Gamaliel II., R. Joshua, R. Akiba and R. Elieser—all authorities of the beginning of the second century—debated whether all the eighteen thanksgivings or only a selection from them must be said daily,¹⁶² also in what manner the additions concerning the rainy season and the Sabbath should be inserted, and in what form to pray on New Year's day.¹⁶³ Hence it must have virtually attained its present form about A.D. 70–100, and its groundwork may safely be regarded as considerably more ancient. This inference is confirmed by the definite information of the Talmud, that Simon the cotton dealer at Jabne in the time of Gamaliel II. arranged the eighteen thanksgivings according to their order, and that Samuel the Little, at R. Gamaliel's invitation, inserted the prayer against apostates (מִיָּיִם), which makes it consist, not of eighteen, but of nineteen sections.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ *Berachoth* iv. 3; *Taanith* ii. 2.

¹⁶² *Berachoth* iv. 3.

¹⁶³ *Berachoth* v. 2; *Rosh hashana* iv. 5; *Taanith* i. 1–2. At the close of the Sabbath the so-called הַבְּדִלָּה, i.e. the "separation," by which the Sabbath was separated from the week-day, was inserted. See *Berachoth* v. 2 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, i. 18). Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* s.v. הַבְּדִלָּה.

¹⁶⁴ *Berachoth* 28^b: שמעון הפקולי הסדיר שמונה עשרה ברכות לפני רבן נמליאל על הסדר ביבנה. אמר להם רבן נמליאל לחכמים, כלום יש אדם שיודע לחקן ברכת המינים? עמד שמואל הקטן ותקנה. The question is immediately before asked, why there are nineteen instead of eighteen *Berachoth*. The ברכת המינים (for this is undoubtedly the correct reading instead of ברכת הצדוקים, which the editions have, see Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* s.v. מִיָּיִם) forms the 12th Berachah. But instead of the original מִיָּיִם, we have in the present text of the prayer מְלַשְׁשִׁים (slanderers), the former being corrected by the insertion of only two letters. Comp. Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, p. 345 sq. The מִיָּיִם are "apostates" in general, not merely Jewish Christians, as is often supposed. The Fathers were not however quite in the wrong when they referred the *Birkath hamminim* chiefly to Jewish Christians. Comp. Epiphan. *haer.* xxix. 9: Οὐ μόνον γὰρ οἱ τῶν Ἰουδαίων παῖδες πρὸς τοὺς κείτηνται μῖσος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνιστάμενοι ἔωθεν καὶ μέσης ἡμέρας καὶ περὶ τὴν ὑσπέραν, τρίς τῆς ἡμέρας, ὅτε εὐχάς

ἐπιτελοῦσιν ἑαυτοῖς ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, ἐπαρῶνται αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἀναθεματίζουσι
τρὶς τῆς ἡμέρας φάσκοντες ὅτι Ἐπικαταράσαι ὁ θεὸς τοὺς Ναζωραίους.
Hieronymus *ad Jesaj.* v. 18-19, ed. Vallarsi, iv. 81: (Judaei) usque hodie
perseverant in blasphemiiis et ter per singulos dies in omnibus synagogis
sub nomine Nazarenorum anathematizant vocabulum Christianum. Idem,
ad Jesaj. xlix. 7, ed. Vallarsi, iv. 565: (Judaei Christo) ter per singulos dies
sub nomine Nazarenorum maledicunt in synagogis suis. Idem, *ad Jesaj.*
lii. 4 ff., ed. Vallarsi, iv. 604: (Judaei) diebus ac noctibus blasphemant
Salvatorem et sub nomine, ut saepe dixi, Nazarenorum ter in die in
Christianos congerunt maledicta. Less decidedly Justinus, *Dialog. c.*
Tryph. c. 16: Καταρῶμενοι ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ὑμῶν τοὺς πιστεύοντας ἐπὶ
τὸν Χριστόν. Justin frequently expresses himself in the same manner (see
Otto on the passage). Comp. also especially c. 137: Συμφάμενοι οὖν μὴ
λοιδορῆτε ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, μηδὲ Φαρισαίοις πειθόμενοι διδασκάλοις τὸν
βασιλέα τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπισκώψητέ ποτε, ὅποια διδάσκουσιν οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι
ὑμῶν, μετὰ τὴν προσευχὴν. It is striking, that according to this, the
cursing formula was pronounced *after the prayer*. Perhaps this rests upon
a mistake of Justin's; it is however also possible that the *Birkath hamminim*
originally had this position. Comp. Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 1201 sq.
Vitringa, *De synagoga*, pp. 1047-1051. Herzfeld, iii. 203 sq. Grätz,
Gesch. der Juden, iv. 434 sq. Derenbourg, p. 345 sq. Hamburger, ii.
1095 sq.

§ 28. LIFE UNDER THE LAW.

I

ALL zeal for education in the family, the school and the synagogue aimed at making *the whole people a people of the law*. The common man too was to know what the law commanded, and not only to know, but to do it. His whole life was to be ruled according to the norm of the law; obedience thereto was to become a fixed custom, and departure therefrom an inward impossibility. On the whole this object was to a great degree attained. Josephus declares: "Even if we are deprived of wealth, of towns, and of other possessions, the law remains to us for ever. And no Jew will be so far from his native land, nor so much fear a hostile ruler, as not to fear the law more than him."¹ So faithfully did most of the Jews adhere to their law, that they willingly incurred even torture and death itself in consequence. "Often already," says Josephus, "have many of the prisoners been seen to endure the rack and all kinds of death in theatres, for the sake of not uttering a word against the law and the other Holy Scriptures."²

But what were the motives, whence sprang this enthusiasm

¹ *Apion*. ii. 38: Κἄν πλούτου καὶ πόλεων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀγαθῶν στερηθῶμεν, ὁ γοῦν νόμος ἡμῖν ἀθάνατος διαμένει· καὶ οὐδεὶς Ἰουδαίων οὔτε μακρὰν οὕτως ἂν ἀπέλθοι τῆς πατρίδος οὔτ' ἐπίπικρον φοβηθήσεται δεσπότην ὥς μὴ πρὸ ἐκείνου δεδιέναι τὸν νόμον.

² *Apion*. i. 8: "Ἦδη οὖν πολλοὶ πολλάκις ἐώρανται τῶν αἰχμαλώτων στρέβλας καὶ παντοίων θανάτων τρόπους ἐν θεάτροις ὑπομένοντες ἐπὶ τῇ μηδὲν ῥῆμα προέσθαι παρὰ τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὰς μετὰ τούτων ἀναγραφάς. Comp. also *Apion*. i. 22 (from Hekataüs), and ii. 30: πολλοὶ καὶ πολλάκις ἤδη τῶν ἡμετέρων περὶ τοῦ μηδὲ ῥῆμα φθέγξασθαι παρὰ τὸν νόμον πάντα παθεῖν γενναίως προείλοντο.

for the law, what the means whereby it obtained this enormous sway over minds? To answer briefly: it was *faith in Divine retribution*, and that a retribution in the strictest juristic sense. The prophetic idea of the covenant, which God had entered into with the chosen people, was apprehended in the purely juristic sense; the covenant was a legal one, by which both the contracting parties were mutually bound. The people to observe the law given them by God, exactly, accurately and conscientiously: while God was also bound in return to pay the promised recompense in proportion to their performances. And the obligation held good not only with respect to the nation as a whole, but to every individual; performance and recompense always stood in corresponding relations to each other. He who did much had to expect from God's justice the bestowal of much reward; while on the other hand every transgression entailed its corresponding punishment.* The externalism with which this belief in retribution weighed, on the one side transgression and punishment, on the other the fulfilment of the law and reward by each other, will appear from what follows: "Seven different plagues came into the world on account of seven chief transgressions. (1) If part of the people tithe their fruits and part do not, such a famine arises through drought that part of the people are in want and part have enough. (2) If no one tithes, there follows a famine from the devastations of war and from drought. (3) If nowhere the heave dough has been separated, a famine consuming all arises. (4) A pestilence rages when such crimes gain the upper hand as have in Scripture the penalty of death pronounced upon them, but whose perpetrators are not delivered up to justice for its

* Comp. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinaischen Theologie* (1880), pp. 235 ff., 290 ff. Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. art. "Lohn und Strafe" (pp. 691-703), and "Vergeltung" (pp. 1252-1257).

execution. (5) War devastates the land because of delay of sentences, turning aside of law and illegal interpretation of Scripture. (6) Wild beasts get the upper hand on account of perjury and the desecration of the divine name. (7) Carrying away into foreign lands is the punishment for idolatry, incest, murder, and neglect of the Sabbatic year.”⁴ With like conscientiousness was the reward for the fulfilling of the law computed. “Whoever fulfils only *one* law, good is appointed to him, his days are prolonged, and he will inherit the land.”⁵ “According to the proportion of pains taken will be the reward” (לְפָנִים צַעֲרָא אֲנִירָא).⁶ “Know that everything is taken account of” (דַּע שֶׁהַכֹּל לְפִי הַחֲשָׁבוֹן).⁷ Thus every fulfilment of the law involves its corresponding reward. And God only gave so many commandments and so many laws to the people of Israel, that they might obtain great rewards.⁸ Both punishment and reward are bestowed on men in the present life. But full retribution does not follow till the life to come, the עוֹלָם הַבָּא. Then will all seeming inequalities be reconciled. He, who was in this life visited with sorrows, notwithstanding his righteousness, will then receive the fuller reward. But apart from this, full recompense does not take place till the world to come. For the present world is still a world of imperfection and of evil. In the future world all weakness will cease. Then will Israel, both as a nation and as individuals, be rewarded for a faithful fulfilling of the law by a life of undisturbed happiness. Good works—such as reverence of parents, benevolence, peace-making among neighbours, and above all the study of the law—may therefore be looked upon as a capital, whose interest is already enjoyed in this life,

⁴ *Aboth* v. 8–9. So too *e.g.* *Shabbath* ii. 6. The promises and threats of the blessing and the curse in Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii. are the Old Testament foundation for this. But the casuistic carrying out into parallels is alien to the Old Testament.

⁵ *Kiddushin* i. 10.

⁶ *Aboth* v. 23.

⁷ *Aboth* iv. 22.

⁸ *Makkoth* iii. 16.

while the capital itself remains for the life to come. *This hope of a future retribution was therefore the mainspring of all zeal for the law. Nay the entire religious life of the Jewish people during the period of which we are treating just revolved round these two poles: Fulfilment of the law and hope of future glory. Zeal for the former derived its vitality from the latter. The saying of Antigonus of Socho: "Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of reward, but be like those who do service without respect to reward,"*¹⁰ is by no means a correct expression of the keynote of Pharisaic Judaism, which was in fact like the servants who serve for the sake of recompense.

To what *results* then did this zeal for the law lead? They corresponded with its motives. As the motives were essentially of an external kind, so also was the result *an incredible externalizing of the religious and moral life*. This result was indeed inevitable, when once religion was made into law, and that indeed in such wise, that all religion was made to consist in nothing else, than in the strict obedience to a law, which regulated the civil and social as well as the individual life in all its relations. By this view of religious duty, which forms the characteristic distinction of post-exilic Judaism, *the whole religious and moral life was drawn down into the sphere of law, and the result necessarily was as follows: (1) First of all the individual life was thus regulated by a norm, whose application to this sphere at all is an evil. The province of law is simply to order the relations of men to one another according to certain standards. Its object is not the individual as such, but only civil society as a whole. The functions of the latter are to be so regulated, that the fulfilment of his individual task within this framework is to be made possible to each. The application of the legal norm to the individual life therefore of itself subjects the latter to a false standard. For if external constraint is of the essence of law, freedom is of the*

⁹ *Pea* i. 1. *Comp. Kiddushin* iv. 14.

¹⁰ *Aboth* i. 3.

essence of moral action. The moral life of the individual is a healthy one, only when it is governed by internal motives. Its regulation by external standards is an adulteration of it in its very principle. (2) The application of the legal norm to the religious and moral life also involves the placing of the most varying avocations of life upon a level, as though of equal value. For every employment is regulated absolutely by the law, not merely the behaviour of men to one another in the State and in society, but also those most special manifestations of the inner life of the individual: how he shows his gratitude to God or evidences his repentance for sins he has committed, how he manifests his love to his neighbour, how he fashions his daily life in its most external respects, in manners and customs. All falls under the same point of view—under the norm of the law, and that a law which comes forward with Divine authority. Thus the purport of an act is comparatively indifferent. Merely conventional demeanour in outward matters and ceremonies is of the same value as the fulfilment of the highest religious and moral duties. The former is raised to the rank of the latter, and the latter lowered to that of the former. There is always and everywhere only one duty—the fulfilling of the law, *i.e.* the fulfilling of all that has once been commanded by God, no matter of what kind it may be. (3) Hence it is self-evident, that all in reality depends upon satisfying the law. There is no higher task in the department of law. If the requirement of the law is exactly fulfilled, duty is satisfied. Thus the only question that can be raised is: what is commanded? and what must be done that the commandment may be fulfilled? That every art should be directed only to compounding with the letter of the law is an inevitable consequence. This task will perhaps be aggravated, more rather than less will be done for the sake of meeting in practice the whole extent of the law. But still one purpose only will be kept in view, that of satisfying the

letter. And this cannot be done without damage to the substance. The real value of the good is left out of account. Not the doing of the good as such, but merely formal accuracy in fulfilling the letter of the law is the aim. And notwithstanding all zeal, nay just because of it, true morality must of necessity be a loser. (4) Lastly the purely formal point of sight has the further consequence, that the moral duty is split up into an endless atomistic multitude of separate duties and obligations. All law is necessarily casuistic, for it lays down a multiplicity of individual statutes. All casuistry is by its nature endless. The *one* case may have been divided into ever so many sub-species; but each sub-species can again be split into sub-divisions, and there is here no end to the dividing. The most conspicuous proof of this is furnished by the marvellous labours of the Pharisaic scribes. With all their diligence and acuteness in making distinctions, they never came to an end. But the testimony cannot be refused them, that they really worked hard to do so. Jewish law became in their hands a widely ramified science. They cut up the law into thousands upon thousands of single commands, and thus, as far as in them lay, set up a rule for the direction of every conceivable case of practical life. Marvellous however as were their performances, it is here that their most grievous error is found. All free moral action was now completely crushed under the burden of numberless separate statutory requirements. The greater their number, the more fatal is the effect of the fundamental error of transferring the juristic mode of treatment to the region of religion and morality. In every department of life action no longer proceeds from inward motive, is no longer the free manifestation of a moral disposition, but results from the external constraint of statutory requirement. And such requirement reaches equally to everything, to the greatest as to the least, to the most important as to the most indifferent; every act,

whether great or trifling, when estimated by a moral standard, is now of the same value; there is but one point of view for all: to do what is commanded, because it is commanded. And thus there is of course no higher vocation, than to be faithful to the letter for the letter's sake. All depends, not on the inward motive, but on the external correctness of an action. And all this petty and mistaken zeal insisted finally on being the true and genuine service of God. The more men wearied themselves out with it, the more they thought to gain the Divine approbation. As St. Paul says: *ζηλον θεοῦ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν* (Rom. x. 2). How far this unwise zeal for God went astray, and what a heavy burden it laid upon the life of the Israelite, may be made evident by a series of concrete examples.¹¹

II.

One of the most important points, both with respect to its extent and the value attributed to it, was that of Sabbath sanctification.¹² The brief prohibition of work on the Sabbath which is found in the Pentateuch, and which hardly at all enters into detail (Ex. xvi. 23–30, xx. 8–11, xxiii. 12, xxxi. 12–17, xxxiv. 21, xxxv. 1–3; Lev. xxiii. 3; Num. xv. 32–36;

¹¹ In this series those points are chiefly brought forward, which are touched on in the Gospels. It should then be remembered, with respect to the date to which the material here adduced belongs, that the authorities cited in the Mishna almost all belong to the hundred years between A.D. 70–170. Hence Jewish law is here presented to us in that form which it maintained in about the first half of the second century. This form will however be essentially that which is handed down from the beginning of the Christian era, from the time of Hillel and Shammai. For the differences of their two schools already related to the subtlest distinctions.

¹² Comp. in the Mishna the treatises *Shabbath*, *Erubin*, *Beza*, the *Book of Jubilees*, cap. 50 (Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 70); also Winer, *Realwörterb.* ii. 343–349. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. xiii. 193–204 (in the 2nd ed. revised by Orelli, xiii. 156–166). Saalschütz, *Das Mosaische Recht*, i. 388 sqq. Mangold in Scherke's *Bibelllex.* v. 123–126. Riehm's *Wörterb.* s.v.

Deut. v. 12-15. Comp. Jer. xvii. 21-24; Amos vii. 5; Neh. x. 32, xiii. 15 sqq.), was in the course of time developed in so many-sided a manner as to form of itself an extensive branch of knowledge. For of course the Rabbis could not rest satisfied with this simple prohibition. They must also accurately define *what work* was forbidden. And consequently they at last, with much ingenuity, got out of it, that on the whole thirty-nine kinds of work were prohibited, but very few are of course anywhere alluded to in the Pentateuch. These thirty-nine prohibited works are: (1) sowing, (2) ploughing, (3) reaping, (4) binding sheaves, (5) threshing, (6) winnowing, (7) cleansing crops, (8) grinding, (9) sifting, (10) kneading, (11) baking, (12) shearing wool, (13) washing, (14) beating, (15) dyeing, (16) spinning, and (17) warping it, (18) making two cords, (19) weaving two threads, (20) separating two threads, (21) making a knot, (22) untying a knot, (23) sewing two stitches, (24) tearing to sew two stitches, (25) catching a deer, (26) killing, (27) skinning, and (28) salting it, (29) preparing its skin, (30) scraping off the hair, (31) cutting it up, (32) writing two letters, (33) blotting out for the purpose of writing two letters, (34) building, (35) pulling down, (36) putting out a fire, (37) lighting a fire, (38) beating smooth with a hammer, (39) carrying from one tenement to another.¹⁸

Each of these chief enactments again require further discussions concerning their range and meaning. And here, properly speaking, begins the work of casuistry. We will bring forward just a few of its results. According to Ex. xxxiv., ploughing and reaping were among the forbidden works. But to gather a few ears of corn was already looked upon as reaping.^{18a}

¹⁸ *Shabbath* vii. 2. The translation here and in what follows is always that of Jost's edition of the Mishna. Comp. also the enumeration in the *Book of Jubilees*, c. 50 (Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 70).

^{18a} Comp. Maimonides in Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* on Matt. xii. 2.

When on one occasion the disciples did this on the Sabbath, they were found fault with by the Pharisees, not on account of plucking the ears, which (according to Deut. xxiii. 26) was permitted, but because they were thus guilty of doing reaping work on the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 1, 2; Mark ii. 23, 24; Luke vi. 1, 2). The prohibition of making and untying a knot (Nos. 21 and 22) was much too general to rest satisfied with. It was also necessary to state to what kind of knot this applied, and to what it did not. "The following are the knots, the making of which renders a man guilty: The knot of camel-drivers and that of sailors; and as one is guilty by reason of tying, so also of untying them. R. Meir says: Guilt is not incurred by reason of a knot, which can be untied with one hand. There are knots by reason of which one is not guilty, as one is in the case of the camel-driver's and sailor's knots. A woman may tie up a slit in her shift and the strings of her cap, those of her girdle, the straps of the shoes and sandals, of skins of wine and oil, of a pot with meat."¹⁴ And to tie strings of the girdle being permitted, it was agreed that a pail also might be tied over the well with a girdle, but not with a rope.¹⁵ The prohibition of writing on the Sabbath (No. 32) was further defined as follows: "He who writes two letters with his right or his left hand, whether of one kind or of two kinds, as also if they are written with different ink or are of different languages, is guilty. He even who should from forgetfulness write two letters is guilty, whether he has written them with ink or with paint, red chalk, India-rubber, vitriol, or anything which makes permanent marks. Also he who writes on two walls which form an angle, or on the two tablets of his account-book, so that they can be read together, is guilty. He who writes upon his body is guilty. If any one writes with dark fluid, with fruit juice, or in the dust on the road, in sand, or in anything in which

¹⁴ *Shabbath* xv. 1-2.¹⁵ *Shabbath* xv. 2.

the writing does not remain, he is free.¹⁶ If any one writes with the wrong hand, with the foot, with the mouth, with the elbow; also if any one writes upon a letter of another piece of writing, or covers other writing; also if any one meaning to write □ has only written two † †, or if any one has written one letter on the ground and one upon the wall, or upon two walls of the house, or upon two pages of a book, so that they cannot be read together, he is free. If in forgetfulness he writes two letters at different times, perhaps one in the morning and one towards evening, R. Gamaliel pronounces him guilty, the learned declare him free.”¹⁷ According to Ex. xvi. 23, it was forbidden to bake and to boil on the Sabbath. Hence the food, which it was desired to eat hot on the Sabbath, was to be prepared before its commencement, and kept warm by artificial means. In doing this however care must be taken, that the existing heat was not increased, which would have been “boiling.” Hence the food must be put only into such substances as would maintain its heat, not into such as might possibly increase it. “Food to be kept warm for the Sabbath must not be put into oil-dregs, manure, salt, chalk, or sand, whether moist or dry, nor into straw, grape-skins, flock, or vegetables, if these are damp, though it may if they are dry. It may, however, be put into clothes, amidst fruits, pigeons’ feathers, and flax-tow. R. Jehudah declares flax-tow unallowable, and permits only coarse tow.”¹⁸ According to Ex. xxxv. 3, it was forbidden to kindle a fire on the Sabbath.

¹⁶ On the statements “he is guilty” (חייב) and “he is free” (פטור), see Jost’s introd. to the treatise *Shabbath*. The former means: the wilful transgressor forfeits his life, and is, if there are witnesses, to be stoned, or if he has sinned after warning, but without witnesses, he is sentenced to the penalty of extirpation. And he who has sinned from negligence or ignorance must offer the legal sin-offering. פטור means he is free from these penalties, but not from the scourging ordered by the court, so that the act itself (a few cases deducted) is not thereby declared allowable.

¹⁷ *Shabbath* xii. 3-6.

¹⁸ *Shabbath* iv. 1, and the commentary in Surenhusius’ *Mishna*, ii. 18.

This prohibition was supplemented by that of extinguishing a fire. With regard to the latter, the question arose, how it was to be observed, when a non-Israelite approached a fire. "If a non-Israelite comes to extinguish a fire, one must neither say to him: 'put it out,' nor 'do not put it out,' and that because one is not obliged to make him rest."¹⁹ It is self-evident that the prohibition to extinguish fire would be extended to lights and lamps. Concerning these it was ordained as follows: "He who extinguishes a light because he is afraid of heathen, robbers, or the evil spirit, or for the sake of one sick, that he may sleep, is free. If it is done however to save the oil, the lamp, or the wick, he is guilty. R. Jose declares him in each case free, except with respect to the wick, because he thus prepares, as it were, a coal."²⁰ "A vessel may be placed under a lamp to catch the sparks, but water may not be put therein, lest the lamp be extinguished."²¹ Very specially copious material for discussion was furnished by the last of the thirty-nine chief works, the carrying a burden from one tenement to another (הַמְצִיָּא מִבֵּית לְבֵית), which was, according to Jer. xvii. 21-24, forbidden. We shall see farther on, what refined sophistry was applied towards enlarging the notion of the *רְשׁוּת*. It may here be briefly mentioned, that even the bulk of what might not be carried from one place to another on the Sabbath was exactly determined. Thus *e.g.* he was guilty of Sabbath desecration who carried out so much food as was equal in weight to a dry fig,²² or so much wine as was enough for mixing in a goblet, or milk enough for one swallow, honey enough to put upon a wound, oil enough to anoint a small member, water enough to moisten an eye-salve,²³ paper enough to write a custom-house notice upon,²⁴ parchment enough to write the shortest portion of the Tephillin, *i.e.* the

¹⁹ *Shabbath* xvi. 6.²¹ *Shabbath* ii. 6, *fin.*²³ *Shabbath* viii. 1.²⁰ *Shabbath* ii. 5.²² *Shabbath* vii. 4.²⁴ *Shabbath* viii. 2.

שמן ישראל, upon, ink enough to write two letters,²⁵ reed enough to make a pen of, etc.²⁶ It was forbidden also to carry such garments as did not belong to clothing proper. A warrior might not go out with coat of mail, helmet, greaves, sword, bow, shield, or spear.²⁷ A cripple might, according to R. Meir, go out with his wooden leg. R. Joses, on the other hand, does not allow it.²⁸ Only on the breaking out of a fire are some concessions made with respect to burden-bearing. "All the Holy Scriptures may be saved from a conflagration. The case of the book may be saved with the book, that of the Tephillin with the Tephillin, even if there is money in it. Food for the three Sabbath meals may be saved. If a fire breaks out on the evening of the Sabbath, let food be saved for three meals; if it takes place in the forenoon, for two; if in the afternoon, for one only. A basketful of bread may also be saved, even if enough for a hundred meals, a cake of figs, a cask of wine."²⁹

The caution of these guardians of the law did not however confine itself to asserting what was forbidden on the Sabbath itself. They extended their prohibitions to every transaction, which might only possibly lead to a desecration of the Sabbath. This prophylactic care was the cause of the following enactments: "Let not a tailor go out at twilight with his needle, for he might forget (when the Sabbath begins) and go out with it. Nor the writer with his reed."³⁰ "Meat, onions and eggs may not be cooked, unless there is time to cook them by day. Bread may not be put into the oven in the twilight, nor cakes upon the coals, unless their surfaces can harden while it is still day. R. Elieser says: If there is only time for the under surface to harden."³¹ Caution goes still farther, when *e.g.* it is forbidden to read by lamp-light on the Sabbath, or to cleanse clothing from vermin.

²⁵ *Shabbath* viii. 3.²⁶ *Shabbath* viii. 5.²⁷ *Shabbath* vi. 2, 4.²⁸ *Shabbath* vi. 8.²⁹ *Shabbath* xvi. 1-3.³⁰ *Shabbath* i. 3.³¹ *Shabbath* i. 10.

For both are transactions in which a clear light is especially necessary. And thus there is obviously a temptation to stoop the lamp for the purpose of leading more oil to it, and this would offend against the prohibition of kindling fire. Hence these actions are altogether forbidden. It is indeed permitted to a schoolmaster to take care how children read by light. But he himself may not read by a light.⁸²

Besides these thirty-nine chief *works*, many other actions and employments, which cannot be summed up under any of them, are also forbidden. We learn of some of them *e.g.* from the following prescription with regard to the holy days (on which the rest was less strict). "All things, by which punishment is incurred on the Sabbath, because of their breaking its rest, or because of acts arbitrary in themselves, or acts legal at other times, are also not allowed on the holy day. The following because of the rest: one may not climb a tree, ride upon a horse, swim in the water, clap with the hands, strike upon the hips, or dance. The following because the acts are arbitrary: one may not hold a court of justice, acquire a wife by earnest money, pull off the shoe (the Chaliza on account of a refusal of levirate marriage), nor consummate levirate marriage. The following because they are legal transactions: one may not consecrate anything, put a value on anything, devote anything, nor separate heave and tithe. All this is declared unlawful on a holy day, not to mention a Sabbath."⁸³ To such appointments belongs also the enactment, that no one should on the Sabbath go farther than 2000 cubits from his dwelling, *i.e.* from where he is at the beginning of the Sabbath. This was called the "Sabbath limit," תחום השבת,⁸⁴ and a distance of 2000 cubits a Sabbath day's journey (Acts i. 12: σαββάτου ὁδός). How ingeniously this

⁸² *Shabbath* i. 3.

⁸³ *Beza* v. 2.

⁸⁴ *Erubin* v. 5. The distance of 2000 cubits (according to Num. xxxv. 1-8), *Erubin* iv. 3, 7, v. 7. Compare in general, Buxtorf, *Lexicon Chaldaicum*,

prescription, founded on Ex. xvi. 29, as well as that concerning the carrying of burdens, was evaded, will be shown farther on.

Notwithstanding the great strictness with which the commandment to hallow the Sabbath was treated, certain cases, in which exceptions were tolerated, had of necessity to be acknowledged. Some such exceptions were allowed for the sake of humanity and some on account of a still higher and more sacred command. In the latter respect the necessities of the temple-ritual came especially under consideration. The daily burnt-offering must be offered on the Sabbath also, nay a special offering besides was ordered on the Sabbath day (Num. xxviii. 9, 10). Hence it was self-evident, that all the transactions necessary for offering these sacrifices must be lawful even on the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 5 : τοῖς σάββασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὸ σάββατον βεβηλοῦσιν καὶ ἀναίτιοί εἰσιν).³⁵ The acts necessary for offering the Passover sacrifice were also allowed on the Sabbath, but in this case it was very carefully settled what transactions were and what were not permitted.³⁶ To the same category belongs also the command of circumcision. All that was necessary for circumcision might be done on the Sabbath, so far, that is, as it could not be done on the day before. For whatever could have been done on the day before was forbidden.³⁷ For the sake of humanity it was permitted to render assistance to

col. 2582-2586 (s.v. **σῆθη**). Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* on Acts i. 12. Winer, *RWB.* ii. 350 sq. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* xiii. 203 sq. Leyrer, *ibid.* xiii. 213 sq. Arnold, *ibid.* ix. 148 (all according to the 1st ed.). Mangold in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* v. 127 sq.

³⁵ Comp. *Book of Jubilees*, c. 50 (Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 70). Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Wetzstein on Matt. xii. 5. Wolf, *Curae philol.* on the same passage. Wünsche, *Der lebensfreudige Jesus* (1876), p. 424.

³⁶ *Pesachim* vi. 1-2. On other exceptions from the Sabbath command in favour of the temple service, see also *Erubin* x. 11-15.

³⁷ *Shabbath* xix. 1-5. Comp. John vii. 22, 23 (one of those features, which prove the intimate acquaintance of the fourth evangelist with Jewish matters)

a woman at her delivery,³⁸ and it was laid down as a general principle, that all danger to life should supersede the Sabbath (כָּל-סֵכָּךְ נִפְשׁוֹת דּוֹחָה אֶת הַשַּׁבָּת).³⁹ "If a building falls upon any one, and it is doubtful whether he is under it or not, whether he is alive or dead, whether he is a non-Israelite or an Israelite, the ruins over him may be cleared away on the Sabbath. If he is found alive, they may be cleared farther; if he is dead, they must be left."⁴⁰ A physician may attend a patient if he is in danger. R. Matthijah ben Charash even allowed that a remedy might on the Sabbath be put into the mouth of any one feeling pain in the throat, because it might be dangerous.⁴¹ This is however cited as only the opinion of this scholar, and by no means as holding good in general. At any rate medical assistance was only allowed on the assumption that life was in danger. "A fracture (of a limb) may not be attended to. If any one has sprained his hand or foot, he may not pour cold water on it."⁴² "A priest officiating in the temple may, on the Sabbath, put on again the plaister which he took off during his ministration; otherwise this may not be done; a plaister may not be put on for the first time on the Sabbath. . . . If a priest hurts his finger, he may on the Sabbath bind it with rushes for service in the sanctuary, otherwise this is not allowed; for the pressing out of the blood, it is everywhere forbidden."⁴³ It quite agrees with this, that the enmity of the Pharisees should have been excited against Jesus on account of His cures on the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 9-13; Mark iii. 1-5; Luke vi. 6-10, xiii. 10-17, xiv. 1-6; John v. 1-16, ix. 14-16).⁴⁴ Even

³⁸ *Shabbath* xviii. 3.

³⁹ *Joma* viii. 6. Comp. also the passage from Synesius in Winer, *RWB.* ii. 345.

⁴⁰ *Joma* viii. 7.

⁴¹ *Joma* viii. 6.

⁴² *Shabbath* xxii. 6.

⁴³ *Erubin* x. 13-14. Comp. also *Edujoth* ii. 5.

⁴⁴ The Rabbinic material has been treated of from a one-sided and distorted point of view in Danz, *Christi curatio sabbathica vindicata ex legibus*

the principle, that danger to life should supersede the Sabbath, was by no means regarded as at all times decisive. At the beginning of the Maccabæan rising a troupe of legalists let themselves perish to the last man, rather than have recourse to the sword on the Sabbath.⁴⁵ From that time forward it was determined to take up the sword for defence, but not for attack upon the Sabbath.⁴⁶ And this principle was on the whole adhered to.⁴⁷ But use was made of it only in cases of extreme necessity. And it often happened even in later times, that hostile generals were able to make use of the Jewish Sabbath to the disadvantage of the Jews.⁴⁸ How strictly the observance of the Sabbath was universally adhered to by Jewish soldiers, appears from the fact, that a man like Josephus regards it as a thing self-evident,⁴⁹ and that the Romans even found themselves obliged to release the Jews entirely from military service, because Jewish Sabbatarianism and Roman discipline were irreconcilable contrasts.⁵⁰

Judaicis (Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, 1736, pp. 569–614). Zipser in Fürst's *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1847, p. 814 sqq.; Jahrg. 1848, pp. 61 sqq., 197 sqq. Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrash* (1878), pp. 150–152. Comp. also Winer, *RWB.* ii. 346. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* xiii. 202 (1st ed.). On cattle which falls into a pit on a holy day, see *Beza* iii. 4.

⁴⁵ 1 Macc. ii. 34–38. Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 6. 2.

⁴⁶ 1 Macc. ii. 39–42. Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 6. 2.

⁴⁷ Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 1–3, xiv. 4. 2, xviii. 9. 2. That to fight on the Sabbath was considered as “forbidden in after times also” (Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, p. 96, note), is not so universally correct. Josephus expressly says, that the law allowed the repulse of a personal attack (*Antt.* xiv. 4. 2).

⁴⁸ *Antt.* xiii. 12. 1, xiv. 4. 2. Comp. also Joseph. *contra Apion.* i. 22, s. fin. (Ptolemy I. Lagos took Jerusalem on a Sabbath). *Book of Jubilees*, c. 50 (Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 70).

⁴⁹ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 8 = *Vita*, 32.

⁵⁰ *Antt.* xiv. 10. 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19. Under the Ptolemies the Jews still took military service (*Antt.* xii. 1 and 2. 4, according to “Pseudo-Aristeas” in Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 107. Merx' *Archiv*, i. 260). Comp. also *Antt.* xi. 8. 5, *fin.*, xiv. 8. 1.

III.

Far deeper was the influence upon daily life of the manifold and far-reaching ordinances concerning *cleanness and uncleanness* and the removal of the latter,⁶¹ than that of the law of the Sabbath. The Old Testament (Lev. xi.-xv.; Num. v. 1-4, and especially chap. xix.) had already given tolerably numerous and stringent precepts on these points, by declaring (for what reasons may be left undiscussed) first certain incidents of sexual life, then certain appearances on persons and objects comprised under the joint term of leprosy, and lastly, the corpses of both men and animals, as unclean and imparting uncleanness. It also gives detailed prescriptions concerning purification by sacrifices or lustrations, which are of very different kinds according to the kind and degree of uncleanness. But ample as were these enactments, they are still but poor and scanty compared with the abundance stored in the Mishna. No less than twelve treatises (filling the whole of the last part of the Mishna) deal with the matters appertaining to this subject. The enumeration of the "chief kinds of uncleanness" (אַבֹּת הַטְּמֵאוֹת), which it must be owned are for the most part based on the enactments of the Pentateuch (Lev. xi.-xv.), form the foundation of all these discussions. On this foundation however is raised an enormous and very complicated structure. For with each of the chief kinds the question has again to be dealt with: under what circumstances such uncleanness is incurred, in what manner and to what extent it is transferred to others, what utensils and

⁶¹ Comp. generally, Winer, *RWB.* ii. 313-319 (art. "Reinigkeit"), Leyrer, art. "Reinigungen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. xii. pp. 620-640. Keil, *Bibl. Archäologie* (2nd ed. 1875), pp. 295-323. Haneberg, *Relig. Alterthümer*, pp. 459-476. Schenkel's *Bibellez.* v. 65-73. Kamphausen in Riehm's *Wörterb.* p. 1274 sqq. König in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. xii. 617-637.

objects are and what are not capable of contracting uncleanness, and lastly, what means and regulations are required for its removal. To give at least a notion to what an extensive branch of knowledge this doctrine of uncleanness had been developed, some of the enactments concerning the utensils, which do and which do not contract uncleanness and by contact propagate it, are here given. The Old Testament basis is in Num. xix. 14, 15 and xxxi. 20–24.

A main question is first of all concerning the material of which the utensils are composed, and next concerning their form: whether they are hollow or flat. With respect to hollow *earthen vessels*, it is determined that the air in them contracts and propagates uncleanness, as does also the hollow of the foot, but not their outer side. Their purification can only result from their being broken.⁵³ But how far must the breaking go to effect purification? To this question too we receive an exact answer. A fraction is still esteemed a vessel (and therefore susceptible of defilement) "if, of a vessel holding a log, so much is left as to be able to hold enough to anoint the little toe with; and if, of a vessel holding from a log to a seah space for a quarter of a log, from one to two seahs space for half a log; and from two or three seahs to five, space for a log is left."⁵⁴ While then hollow earthen vessels are not susceptible of defilement outside, though they are so within, the following earthen vessels contract no uncleanness at all: a flat plate without a rim, an open coal-shovel, a gridiron with holes in it for grains of wheat, brick gutters, although they are bent and have a hollow, and others besides.⁵⁴ The following are, on the contrary, capable of defilement: a plate with a rim, a whole coal-shovel, a plate full of bowl-like receptacles, an earthen spice-box or a writing apparatus with several receptacles.⁵⁵ Of *wooden, leathern,*

⁵³ *Kelim* ii. 1.⁵⁴ *Kelim* ii. 3.⁵⁵ *Kelim* ii. 2.⁵⁶ *Kelim* ii. 7.

bone and glass vessels, the flat ones are also insusceptible of defilement; the deep ones, on the contrary, not only like the earthen ones, contract defilement in their atmosphere, but also on the outside. If they break, they are clean. If utensils are again made of them, they are again susceptible of defilement.⁵⁶ Here too arises again the difficult question: When are they to be accounted broken? "In all vessels for domestic purposes the measure (of a hole producing cleanness) is a pomegranate. R. Elieser says: The measure depends upon the use of the utensil."⁵⁷ "The pomegranate appointed as a measure is one not too large, but of a medium size."⁵⁸ "If a foot is wanting to a chest, a trunk or a press, it is clean, although capable of holding things. R. Joses considers all these as susceptible of defilement if, though not in proper repair, they are capable of holding the measure."⁵⁹ "A (three-footed) table, to which one foot is wanting, is clean, so is it if a second foot is gone, but if the third is also gone and it is to be used as a flat board, it is susceptible of defilement."⁶⁰ "A seat of which one side plank is missing is clean, so is it although a second is missing. If a hand-breadth in height is left it is capable of defilement."⁶¹ Moreover in hollow utensils not only are the inside and outside, but also the "place for laying hold," to be distinguished. "If *e.g.* the hands are clean and the outside of the cup unclean, and the cup is held at the part which serves for holding, one need not be anxious lest the hands should be defiled by the outside of the cup."⁶² "Of *metal vessels* the smooth and the hollow are capable of defilement. If they are broken, they are clean; if vessels are again made out of them they are in their former uncleanness."⁶³ "Every metal

⁵⁶ *Kelim* ii. 1, xv. 1.

⁵⁸ *Kelim* xvii. 4-5.

⁶⁰ *Kelim* xxii. 2.

⁶² *Kelim* xxv. 7, 8.

⁵⁷ *Kelim* xvii. 1.

⁵⁹ *Kelim* xviii. 3.

⁶¹ *Kelim* xx. 3.

⁶³ *Kelim* xi. 1.

vessel, which has a special name of its own, is capable of defilement; except a door, the bolt, the lock, the hinge-socket, the hinge, the knocker and a gutter; because they are fastened to the ground.”⁶⁴ “In a bridle, the bit is capable of defilement, the plates on the cheeks are clean; according to R. Akiba, unclean. The learned say: only the bit is unclean, but the plates, only when they are fastened to it.”⁶⁵ “Round horns (for blowing) are susceptible of defilement, straight ones are clean. If the mouthpiece is of metal, it is capable of defilement.”⁶⁶ “Wood used on metal utensils is capable of defilement, metal used on wooden ones is clean. *E.g.* a wooden key with metal teeth is capable of defilement, even if the tooth is of only one piece. But if the key is of metal and the tooth of wood, it is not capable of defilement.”⁶⁷

The enactments concerning the removal of defilement by sacrifices and lustrations form a fit pendant to those concerning defilement. We will here quote a few of the latter. The main question in this matter is, as to what water is adapted to the different kinds of purification: to the sprinkling of the hands, the washing of utensils, the bath of purification for persons. The Mishna distinguishes six gradations of water reservoirs: 1. A pond and the water in ditches, cisterns or pits, also spring water no longer flowing, and collected water to the amount of less than forty seahs. All this, so far as it has not been defiled, is adapted for (the preparation of) Challa,⁶⁸ and for legal washing of the hands. 2. Spring water still running. This may be used for the heave (Terumah) and for the washing of the hands. 3. Collected water which amounts to forty seah. In this one may plunge oneself (take a bath of purification) and utensils. 4. A spring with little water, into which more drawn water has been poured. It resembles the

⁶⁴ *Kelim* xi. 2.⁶⁵ *Kelim* xi. 5.⁶⁶ *Kelim* xi. 7.⁶⁷ *Kelim* xiii. 6.⁶⁸ The heave offering of dough, which must be separated at baking.

former by purifying as a plunging bath in the place where it is collected (*i.e.* without running), and clean spring water, in that vessels are purified in it although there is but little of it. 5. Running water in which a change has taken place (*i.e.* water arising from mineral or warm springs). This purifies in running. 6. Clean spring water. This serves as a plunging-bath for running sores, for the sprinkling of lepers, and is suitable for sanctifying with ashes of purification.⁶⁸ These general maxims then form the foundation of a casuistry, which here again loses itself in endless detail. The Mishna especially launches forth in wearying diffuseness on what conditions and prerequisites the "collected water" mentioned in No. 3 (*i.e.* such rain, spring or river water as is not drawn, but conducted directly through gutters or pipes into a receptacle) is fit for bathing and for plunging of utensils, for which purpose the chief matter is that no "drawn water" should be mingled with it. We give a few examples by way of illustration. "R. Elieser says: A quarter of a log of drawn water, to begin with, makes the water, which afterwards falls into it, unfit for a plunging bath; but three logs of drawn water, if there was already other water there. The learned say: three logs, whether at the beginning or to make up the quantity."⁶⁹ "If any one places vessels under the pipes (which run into the plunging bath), they make the bath unsuitable (because it then counts as drawn water). According to the school of Shammai it is all the same, whether they have been placed there or forgotten; according to the school of Hillel, they do not make it unfit, if they were only forgotten."⁷¹ "If drawn water and rain water are mixed in the court, or in the excavation, or upon the steps of the bathing-place, the bath is fit, if there is most of the fit water, and unfit, if there is most of the unfit, or if there is an equal quantity of both. But only so, if they were mixed before they arrived at the collected water

⁶⁸ *Mikwaoth* i. 1-8.⁶⁹ *Mikwaoth* ii. 4.⁷¹ *Mikwaoth* iv. 1.

If both run into the bath, then if it is certain that there were in it forty seahs of proper water before three logs of drawn water fell into it, it is fit, but otherwise unfit.”⁷² It was also disputed, whether snow, hail, hoar frost, ice and the like were fit to mix in the filling of a plunging bath or not.⁷³ Extremely minute too are the directions concerning the *washing* or correct *pouring upon* the hands. It was needful that the hands should always have water poured on them before eating. (To dip them in water was only necessary for eating holy things, *i.e.* things pertaining to sacrifices.) Then it was fully discussed, from what vessels such pouring should take place, what water was suitable for it, who might pour it, and how far the hands must be poured on.⁷⁴ We see with what zeal all these enactments concerning the washing of hands and the cleansing of cups, pots, dishes and seats were already observed in the time of Christ, from repeated allusions in the Gospels, which again receive their full light and aptest illustration through the details of the Mishna (Matt. xv. 2; Mark vii. 2-5; Matt. xxiii. 25, 26; Luke xi. 38, 39).

IV.

From what has been stated it is abundantly evident, what enormous importance was everywhere attributed to external correctness of action, which is indeed a self-evident result, when once moral obligations are regarded in a legal manner. Highly characteristic of this strong tendency to externalism are the *three mementoes*, by which every Israelite, who is faithful to the law, is to be constantly reminded of his duties towards God. These three mementoes are: 1. The Zizith (צִיצִית,

⁷² *Mikwaoth* iv. 4.

⁷³ *Mikwaoth* vii. 1.

⁷⁴ *Berachoth* viii. 2-4; *Chagiga* ii. 5-6; *Edujoth* iii. 2; *Jadajim* i. 1-5, ii. 3. Lightfoot and other expositors on Matt. xv. 2. Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien* (1878), p. 180 sq. *Hamburger Real-Enc.*, art. “Händewaschen.”

plur. צִיִּיּוֹת), *κράσπεδα* in the LXX. and in the New Testament, כְּרוֹסְפֵדִין in the Targum Onkelos, and τὸ κόκκινον ῥάμμα in Justin Martyr,⁷⁵ tassels or fringes of hyacinth blue or white wool, which every Israelite, by reason of the prescription, Num. xv. 37 sqq., Deut. xxii. 12, had to wear at the four corners of his upper garment. They were to be used, as it is said in the passage first quoted, "that ye may look upon them and remember all the commandments of the Lord and do them."⁷⁶ 2. The Mesusa (מְזוּזָה), an oblong box, fixed to house and room doors above the right hand door-post, on which was written (according to the direction, Deut. vi. 9, xi. 20), in twenty-two lines, the two paragraphs, Deut. vi. 4-9 and xi. 13-21.⁷⁷ 3. The *Tephillin* or prayer-straps, which every

⁷⁵ Justin. *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 46, s. fin. (ed. Otto, ii. 154). The editions have indeed τὸ κόκκινον βάμμα (colour), which gives no sense. That the true reading is ῥάμμα is evident from Hesychius, *Lex. s.v. κράσπεδα*: τὰ ἐν τῷ ἄκρῳ τοῦ ἱματίου κεκλωσμένα ῥάμματα καὶ τὸ ἄκρον αὐτοῦ.

⁷⁶ Comp. Pseudo-Aristeas, ed. Mor. Schmidt, in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 281. 13 sq.; Matt. ix. 20, xiv. 36, xxiii. 5; Mark vi. 56; Luke viii. 44. The LXX. and Targum Onkelos on Num. xv. 38 and Deut. xxii. 12. Mishna, *Moed Katan* iii. 4; *Edujoth* iv. 10; *Menachoth* iii. 7, iv. 1. The Rabbinical directions are brought together in an edition of the treatise Zizith by Raphael Kirchheim (*Septem libri Talmudici parvi Hierosolymitani*, ed. Raph. Kirchheim, 1851). Hiller, *De vestibus fimbriatis Hebraeorum* (Ugolini, *Thesaurus*, vol. xxi.). Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica*, pp. 160-170; *Lex. Chald.* col. 1908 sq. Carpov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, p. 197 sqq. Bodenschatz, *Kirchl. Verfassung der heutigen Juden*, iv. 9-14. Levy, *Chald. Wörterb.* ii. 322. Winer, *RWB.*, art. "Saum." Haneberg, *Relig. Alterthümer*, pp. 592-594. Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien*, pp. 274 f., 378. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen paläst. Theologie*, pp. 26-28. Riehm's *Wörterb.*, art. "Läpplein." The colour of the Zizith is now white, while originally it was to be of hyacinth blue. The Mishna, *Menachoth* iv. 1, already presupposes that both are allowed. They are also not now worn, as the Pentateuch directs, and as was still the custom in the time of Christ, on the upper garment (מְלִיץ, ἱμάτιον), but on the two square woollen shawls, one of which is always worn on the body, while the other is only wound round the head during prayer. Both these shawls are also called Tallith.

⁷⁷ Comp. Pseudo-Aristeas, ed. Mor. Schmidt, in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 281. 15 sqq. Josephus, *Antt.* iv. 8. 18. Mishna, *Berachoth* iii. 3; *Shabbath* viii. 3;

male Israelite had to put on at morning prayer (except on Sabbaths and holy days), in the Old Testament תָּפִלִּים (frontlets and bracelets), in Rabbinic Hebr. תְּפִלָּין (from תְּפִלָּה, prayer), in the New Testament φυλακτήρια (preservatives, amulets), incorrectly translated "Denkzettel" (memorandum) by Luther. Their use is founded upon the passages Ex. xiii. 9, 16; Deut. vi. 8, xi. 18. There were two of them: (a) The תְּפִלָּה שֶׁל יָד (Tephilla for the hand) or תְּפִלָּה שֶׁל זְרוּעַ (Tephilla for the arm),⁷⁸ a small dice-shaped hollow parchment case, in which lay a small roll of parchment, on which were written the passages Ex. xiii. 1–10, xiii. 11–16; Deut. vi. 4–9, xi. 13–21. It was fastened by means of a strap drawn through it to the upper part of the left arm. (b) The תְּפִלָּה שֶׁל רֹאשׁ (Tephilla for the head), a case of the same kind, but differing from the former by being divided into four compartments, holding four little rolls of parchment, on which were the above-named passages from the Bible. It was fastened by means of a strap to the forehead just below the hair.⁷⁹ Of these three mementoes the first is

Megilla i. 8; *Moed Katan* iii. 4; *Gittin* iv. 6; *Menachoth* iii. 7; *Kelim* xvi. 7, xvii. 16. The Rabbinical directions are put together in the treatise *Mesusa* (edited by Kirchheim in the above-named collection). Dassovius, *De ritibus Mezuzae* (Ugolini, *Thesaurus*, t. xxi.). Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica*, pp. 581–587; *Lex. Chald.* col. 654. Bodenschatz, *Kirchl. Verfassung der heutigen Juden*, iv. 19–24. Levy, *Chald. Wörterb.* ii. 19 sq. Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* xi. 642 (2nd ed. xi. 668). Haneberg, *Relig. Alterthümer*, pp. 595–598. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, art. "Mesusa."

⁷⁸ The former e.g. *Menachoth* iv. 1; the latter *Mikwaoth* x. 3.

⁷⁹ Comp. Pseudo-Aristeas, ed. Schmidt in *Merx' Archiv*, i. 281. 18 sqq.; *Matt.* xxiii. 5. Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 8. 13. Justinus Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 46, s. *fin.* (ed. Otto, ii. 154). Origen on *Matt.* xxiii. 5 (ed. Lommatzsch, iv. 201); the patristic expositors in general, on *Matt.* xxiii. 5. Mishna, *Berachoth* iii. 1, 3; *Shabbath* vi. 2, viii. 3, xvi. 1; *Erubin* x. 1–2; *Shekalim* iii. 2; *Megilla* i. 8, iv. 8; *Moed Katan* iii. 4; *Nedarim* ii. 2; *Gittin* iv. 6; *Sanhedrin* xi. 3; *Shebuoth* iii. 8–11; *Menachoth* iii. 7, iv. 1; *Arachin* vi. 3, 4; *Kelim* xvi. 7, xviii. 8, xxiii. 1; *Mikwaoth* x. 2, 3, 4; *Jadajim* iii. 3. Targum Onkelos on Ex. xiii. 16; Deut. vi. 8. Pseudo-Jonathan on Ex. xxxix. 31; Deut. xi. 18. Targum on the Song of Solomon viii. 3; on

at any rate founded on the directions of the Pentateuch, and probably the two others also, inasmuch as, at least in the passage of Deuteronomy, the literal interpretation is certainly the correct one (see Dillmann on Ex. xiii. 16). But the value which was set upon these externals, and the care with which everything was here ordered down to the smallest detail, is quite characteristic of later Judaism. How many threads the Zizith were to consist of, how long they were to be, how many knots were to be tied in them, and in what manner these were to be made, how the paragraphs of the Mesusa and Tephillin were to be written, how large the cases and how long the straps of the latter were to be, how they were to be fastened to the head and arm, and how often the straps should be bound round the latter: all this was settled with the most anxious care. There was almost as great reverence for the Tephillin as for the Scriptures.⁸⁰ It was permitted to rescue the former as well as the latter from a fire even on the Sabbath.⁸¹ The Tephillin and Mesusa were held in such

Esther viii. 16. Babylon. Talmud, *Shabbath* 28^b, 62^a; *Erubin* 95^b to 97^a; *Megilla* 24^b; *Menachoth* 34^b to 37^a, 42^b to 44^b. (The passages from the Targum and Talmud after Pinner.) The treatise *Tefillin* (edited by Kirchheim) gives a collection of Rabbinical prescriptions. Ugolini, *De Phylacteriis Hebraeorum* (*Thesaurus*, tom. xxi.). Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica*, pp. 170–185; *Lex. Chald.* col. 1743 sq. Spencer, *De natura et origine Phylacteriorum* (in *De legibus Hebraeorum ritualibus*, ed. Tübing. 1732, pp. 1201–1232). Carpov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, pp. 190–197. Bodenschatz, *Kirchl. Verfassung der heutigen Juden*, iv. 14–19. Lightfoot on Matt. xxiii. 5. Wolf, *Curæ phil.*, and other expositors on Matt. xxiii. 5. Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung des Alten Test. mit dem Neuen*, pp. 360–362. Winer, *RWB.* ii. 260 sq. (art. “Phylakterien”). Pinner, *Uebersetzung des Tractates Berachoth*, fol. 6a, Explanation 33. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 223–225. Leyrer, art. “Phylakterien,” in Herzog’s *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. xi. 639–643 (2nd ed. xi. 666–669). Haneberg, *Relig. Alterthümer*, pp. 587–592. Levy, *Chald. Wörterb.* ii. 549 sq. Delitzsch, art. “Denkzettel,” in Riehm’s *Wörterb.* (with illustrations). Klein, *Die Totaphoth nach Bibel und Tradition* (*Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.* 1881, pp. 666–689). Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, art. “Tephillin.”

⁸⁰ *Jadajim* iii. 3.

⁸¹ *Shabbath* xvi. 1.

superstitious estimation that they were looked upon as preservatives against demoniacal powers, as is evident in the case of the former from the name *φυλακτήρια*.

Such external formalism is, as all can see, very far removed from true piety. The latter certainly might even under such a burden still continue to maintain a bare existence; but when besides this even *prayer* itself, that centre of the religious life, was bound in the fetters of a rigid mechanism, vital piety could scarcely be any longer spoken of. This fatal step had also been already taken by Judaism in the time of Christ. The two chief prayers then always customary for private use are: (1) the Shema, which was to be recited twice a day, not a prayer properly speaking, but a confession of the God of Israel; and (2) the Shemoneh Esreh, the usual daily prayer, which was to be said morning, noon and evening (particulars § 27, Appendix). These prayers too were now made the subjects of casuistic discussions, and their use was thereby degraded to an external function.⁸² This applies especially to the Shema, to which we may here the more confine ourselves, in that it is questionable, whether the Shemoneh Esreh had in the time of Christ already attained a settled form. First of all, the period of time within which the evening and morning Shema were to be said had to be exactly determined. The point of commencement for the former was the time "when the priests return to eat their Terumah (Heave);" the point of conclusion, according to R. Elieser, the end of the first night-watch; according to the usual view, midnight; according to R. Gamaliel, the appearance of dawn.⁸³ The morning Shema may be said "as soon as one can distinguish between blue and white. R. Elieser says: between blue and leek-green." It may be said "till

⁸² Comp. also Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*, pp. 40-42.

⁸³ *Berachoth* i. 1.

the sun appears. R. Joshua says till three o'clock (nine according to our reckoning), for it is the custom of the children of princes not to rise till three."⁸⁴ The Shema, consisting chiefly of paragraphs from the Bible, the question next arose, whether any one, who at the time for saying the Shema is reading the Bible, and reads the paragraphs in question in the midst of their context, has sufficiently done his Shema duty or not. To this it is answered: If he thought of it (אם לבו), he has sufficiently done it; but not otherwise.⁸⁵ It is very characteristic, and a confirmation of the saying of Christ (Matt. vi. 5) concerning praying in the streets, that the question is also discussed, whether and under what circumstances salutations may be made while praying the Shema. Three cases came under consideration: (1) Salutations from fear (מפני היראה); (2) salutations from reverence (מפני הקבוצ); and (3) salutations of every one (לכל אדם); besides which a salutation and a response to a salutation were to be distinguished; and lastly, it was to be considered, that there were in the Shema itself natural breaks, viz. between the first and second Berachah, between the latter and the paragraph Deut. xi. 13-21, and between that and the paragraph Num. xv. 37-41, and lastly between that and the final Berachah. R. Meir therefore allowed that at the breaks the salutation from reverence might be made and returned, but that in the middle only the salutation from fear might be given and returned. R. Jehudah however went a step farther, and allowed also to return the salutation of reverence in the middle, and at the breaks to return the salutation of every one.⁸⁶ The following general directions were given: "He who prays the Shema, without making it audible to his ear, has performed his duty. R. Joses says: He has not performed it. He who prays and has not exactly noticed the letters has, according to R. Joses, satisfied his duty; but according to R. Jehudah he has not.

⁸⁴ *Berachoth* i. 2.⁸⁵ *Berachoth* ii. 1.⁸⁶ *Berachoth* ii. 1-2.

He who prays in a wrong order has not done his duty. He who makes a mistake must begin again where he made the mistake. Workmen may pray in a tree or upon the wall.”⁸⁷

It was a good custom, *that food and drink should* (according to the precept Deut. viii. 10) *never be partaken of without thanksgiving to God.* Grace (Berachoth) was said both before and after meals, and also by women, slaves and children.⁸⁸ But here too regulations were made down to the pettiest detail: viz. what form was to be used for the fruits of the trees, what for wine, what for the fruits of the ground, for bread, for vegetables, for vinegar, for unripe fallen fruit, for locusts, milk, cheese, eggs; and scholars contended as to when this and when that form was suitable.⁸⁹ “If a blessing has been spoken on wine before the meal, the wine after the meal is exempt.” “If the blessing has been pronounced over a side-dish before the meal, the side-dish after the meal is exempt. If the blessing has been said over the bread, the side-dish is exempt.”⁹⁰ “If salted food is set before any one first and bread afterwards, the blessing is to be spoken over the salted food and the bread exempted.”⁹¹ “If any one has eaten figs, grapes and pomegranates, he is to say three blessings afterwards. This is the opinion of R. Gamaliel. The learned say: one blessing of threefold purport.”⁹² “For how much food is formal preparation for thanksgiving requisite? For food the size of an olive. R. Jehudah says: of an egg.”⁹³ “If any one has eaten and forgotten to say grace, he must, according to the school of

⁸⁷ *Berachoth* ii. 3-4.

⁸⁸ *Berachoth* iii. 3-4. It is well known, that grace at meals was also a custom with Christians from the very first (Rom. xiv. 6; 1 Cor. x. 30; 1 Tim. iv. 4), as indeed Jesus Himself always practised this usage (Matt. xiv. 19, xv. 36, xxvi. 26, and parallel passages). See in general, Winer, *RWB.* i. 398. Arnold, art. “Mahlzeiten der Hebräer,” in Herzog’s *Real-Enc.* viii. 6. 88 (2nd ed. ix. 202).

⁸⁹ *Berachoth* vi. 1-3.

⁹⁰ *Berachoth* vi. 5.

⁹¹ *Berachoth* vi. 7.

⁹² *Berachoth* vi. 8.

⁹³ *Berachoth* vii. 2.

Shammai, return to his place and say grace; the school of Hillel allows him to say it where he remembers it. How long does the obligation to say grace last? Till the food is digested.”⁹⁴

When such restriction was laid upon prayer by the legal formula, it could not but be chilled into an external performance. Of what avail was it that the prayers themselves were beautiful and copious (as must be admitted especially of the Shemoneh Esreh), if they were nevertheless only said for the sake of “fulfilling a duty”? Of what avail was it for R. Elieser to declare, that “he who makes his prayer an appointed duty (עֲבָדָה), his prayer is no devout supplication,”⁹⁵ when he himself contributed to make it the former? If a legalistic treatment of the moral life in general is an evil, it is twice and thrice such in the case of prayer, that tenderest blossom of the inmost heart. It was only the necessary result of such a mode of treatment, that men sank so low as to degrade prayer to the service of vanity (Matt. vi. 5), and to misuse it as a covering of inward impurity (Matt. xv. 7 sq.; Mark vii. 6, xii. 40; Luke xx. 47).

A further point, in which the utter externalism of the religious life comes to light, is that of *fasting*. That the Pharisees fasted often, and set great value upon this act, we learn in a general manner from the Gospels (Matt. ix. 14, Mark ii. 18; Luke v. 33). Particulars as to the kind and manner of fasting are found in the Mishna, whose details are again confirmed by the Gospels. Public or general fasts (which were ordered especially on the failure of rain in autumn, and at all times of public misfortune) were always delayed till the second and fifth days of the week (Monday and Thursday), and so that they always began on the second. Thus a three days’ fast would fall upon the second, fifth and second (Monday, Thursday, Monday), and a six days’ fast would then continue on the fifth, second and fifth, etc.⁹⁶

⁹⁴ *Berachoth* viii. 7.

⁹⁵ *Berachoth* iv. 4. Comp. *Aboth* ii. 13.

⁹⁶ *Taanith* ii. 9. Comp. *Διδασχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων* (ed. Bryennios,

Besides these general and appointed fasts, to which every one had to submit, there was also much voluntary fasting, and the strictest went so far as to fast on the two above-named weekdays all the year round.⁹⁷ The external behaviour differed according to the strictness of the fast. In the slighter kind they used still to wash and anoint themselves; in the stricter both were omitted; and in the strictest of all, every kind of pleasant transaction, even mutual greetings, were abstained from.⁹⁸ It was generally preferred to practise fasting in the most public manner possible, and thus to make a show of pious zeal. But the worst was the fundamental view, from which all this proceeded. It was thought by such self-infliction to put a pressure upon God, and as it were to extort favours from Him if He withheld them. The longer the rain was delayed in autumn, the stricter did the fasting become. If the 17th Marcheshvan came before the rain fell, individuals began to hold fasts of three days. If the new moon of Chisleu appeared without rain having fallen, three general fasts were ordered. If after these had taken place no rain had fallen, three more fast days, and indeed with certain severities, were ordered. If these passed by without rain,

1888), c. 8: Αἱ ἡμετέριαι ὑμῶν μὴ ἔστωσαν μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν νηστεύουσι γὰρ δευτέρῃ σαββάτῳ καὶ πέμπτῃ· ὑμεῖς δὲ νηστεύσατε τετράδα καὶ παρασκευῇ. The same almost literally in *Const. apost.* vii. 23. Epiphani. *haer.* xvi. 1 (ed. Petav. p. 34): ἐνήστευον δις τοῦ σαββάτου, δευτέρῳ καὶ πέμπτῃ. *Josephi Hypomnesticum*, c. 145 (in Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* vol. ii. Appendix).

⁹⁷ *Ev. Luc.* xviii. 12; comp. *Taanith fol.* 12^a (in Lightfoot and Wetzstein on *Luke* xviii. 12): יהיד שקיבל עליו שני וחמישי ושני של כל שנה. "An individual who takes it upon himself on the second, fifth, and second days during the whole year," etc. The widely-spread opinion, that all the Pharisees observed the two fast days during the whole year is, according to this, incorrect.

⁹⁸ *Taanith* i. 4-7; in all points confirmed by *Matt.* vi. 16-18 (where the figurative construction of the direction given by Jesus is not, as Meyer thinks, self-evident, but utterly preposterous. Jesus meant to say that fasting should not be shown externally, and therefore the usual washing and anointing not omitted). Comp. also *Joma* viii. 1

seven general fast days were prescribed, again with fresh severities.⁹⁹

V.

The examples brought forward will have made sufficiently evident the manner in which the moral and religious life was conceived of and regulated from the juristic point of view. In all questions everything depended only upon settling what was according to law, and that with the utmost possible care, that so the acting subject might have certain directions for every individual case. In a word: ethic and theology were swallowed up in jurisprudence. The evil results of this external view on practical matters are very evident. And such results were its necessary consequence. Even in that most favourable case of juristic casuistry moving on the whole in morally correct paths, it was in itself a poisoning of the moral principle, and could not but have a paralysing and benumbing effect upon the vigorous pulsation of the moral life. But this favourable case by no means occurred. When once the question was started: "What have I to do to fulfil the law?" the temptation was obvious, that a composition with the letter would be chiefly aimed at, at the cost of the real demands of morality, nay of the proper intention of the law itself.

A tolerably harmless, and in its harmlessness a ludicrous example of the manner in which elaborate ingenuity may find ways and means of at once evading the law and yet fulfilling it, is given by the appointments concerning the so-called *Erubh*. It was, as we know, forbidden among other things to carry on the Sabbath an object out of one tenement (רֵשִׁית) into another. This had the inconvenient effect of preventing almost all freedom of movement on the Sabbath, for the term רֵשִׁית (or more exactly רֵשִׁית הַיְּחִיד, the private tenement or dwelling, was

⁹⁹ *Taanith* i. 4-6.

a very narrow one. If however this term could be enlarged, and the largest possible tenements instituted, the evil would happily be remedied. The first means adopted for the attainment of this object was the so-called commixture or connection of courts (עֲרוֹב הַצִּירוֹת), i.e. the connection of several houses standing in one court (each of which forms a רִשּׁוֹת הַיְחָיד) into one רִשּׁוֹת הַיְחָיד. Such a connection was effected by all the inhabitants collecting a certain amount of food before a Sabbath or holy day and placing it in an appointed place, thus showing that they regarded the whole court, with all the dwellings in it, as a common whole. By this contrivance it became lawful to the joint inhabitants to carry in and out within this רִשּׁוֹת on a holy day.¹⁰⁰ Of course it was now settled with great conscientiousness, what kind of food might be used for this *Erubh*, and how much food was necessary, and what particulars were to be observed, as may be read at length in the Mishna.¹⁰¹ Not very much however was obtained by this connection of courts. Hence another means supplementary of the former and far more prolific was hit upon, viz. the "connection of entrances" (עֲרוֹב מְבוֹי), i.e. the shutting off of a narrow court or of a space enclosed on three sides by a cross beam, a rope or a string, by which these became רִשּׁוֹת הַיְחָיד, and thus spaces within which carrying in and out was allowed. In this case also it was very anxiously debated, how high and how broad the openings, the shutting up of which was in question, must be, and of what kind must be the means of closure, the beams, ropes, etc., how thick, how wide, etc.¹⁰²

Besides the carrying of things from one tenement to another, walking a distance of more than 2000 cubits on the Sabbath was also forbidden. For this too a means of mitigation was devised by the "connection of boundaries" (עֲרוֹב תְּחוּמִין). That is, he who desired to go farther than 2000 cubits had only

¹⁰⁰ Jost's introduction to the treatise *Erubin*.

¹⁰¹ *Erubin* vi.-vii.

¹⁰² *Erubin* i. 1 sqq., vii. 6 sqq.

before the beginning of the Sabbath to deposit somewhere within this limit, and therefore perhaps at its end, food for two meals. He thus declared, as it were, that here would be his place of abode, and he might then on the Sabbath go not merely from his actual to his legal abode, but also 2000 cubits from the latter.¹⁰³ Nay such particular preparation was not necessary in all cases. If *e.g.* any one should be on the road when the Sabbath began, and see at a distance of 2000 cubits a tree or a wall, he might declare it to be his Sabbath abode, and might then go not only 2000 cubits to the tree or wall, but also 2000 cubits farther. Only he must do the thing thoroughly, and say: "My Sabbath place shall be at its trunk" (שְׁבִיתָתִי בְעֵקְרוֹ). For if he said only: "My Sabbath place shall be under it" (שְׁבִיתָתִי תַּחְתָּיו), this did not hold good, because it was too general and indefinite.¹⁰⁴

Innocent as such trifling may be in itself, it nevertheless terribly shows, that the moral point of view was entirely superseded by the legal and formal one, that the effort was merely to do justice to the letter of the law, even though its meaning was evaded.

Such shifting of the right point of view necessarily led, in more important cases than those just touched upon, to results in direct opposition to a moral view of things. The woe pronounced by our Lord upon the scribes for lightly trifling with *the oath* by saying: "Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is bound: and whosoever sweareth by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the sacrifice that is on it, he is bound" (Matt. xxiii. 16-18), is well known.¹⁰⁵ So too is their lax interpretation of the injunction

¹⁰³ Jost's introduction to the treatise *Erubin*. More particular enactments, *Erubin* iii. iv. viii.

¹⁰⁴ *Erubin* iv. 7.

¹⁰⁵ Comp. *Shebuoth* iv. 13: He who swears "by heaven and earth," if he swears falsely, is not guilty of perjury. See in general, *Shebuoth* iv. 3 sqq.

concerning divorce, Deut. xxiv. 1: That a man might put away his wife if he had found anything shameful in her (עֲרוּת דָּבָר). Only the school of Shammai left the words their proper meaning. The school of Hillel explained them away as: If she has even spoiled his food. And lastly, according to R. Akiba, a man was allowed to put away his wife if he had found another fairer than she was.¹⁰⁶ The laws of purification gave occasion for treating the sphere of the intercourse of the sexes in a manner very similar to the slippery casuistry of the Jesuits—a striking proof how the casuistic method, as such, leads by an inward necessity to such errors.¹⁰⁷ Another point too affords a striking parallel with Jesuitism, viz. the postponement of the duties of natural piety, *e.g.* towards a father or mother, to supposed religious obligations: “If a man shall say to his father or his mother, that whereby thou mightest have been profited by me is Corban, that is to say, given to God, you allow him to do no more for father or mother” (Mark vii. 11, 12; comp. Matt. xv. 5); it is thus that Jesus reproves the Pharisees, and in agreement with this we read in the Mishna, that a vow made cannot be revoked “on account of the honour due to parents” (בכבוד אביו ואמו).¹⁰⁸ Thus the religious obligation, in its external and formal sense, stands above the supreme duty of natural piety.

All this shows that the Lord had only too much reason for rebuking His contemporaries for straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel (Matt. xxiii. 24), and for hurling in their

Maimonides also says that an oath by heaven and earth is no oath. See the passage in Lightfoot, *Horae hebr.* on Matt. v. 33 (*Opp.* ii. 293). Schöttgen, *Horae hebr.* i. 40.

¹⁰⁶ *Gittin* ix. 10. Comp. Matt. xix. 3. On these dilutions in general, see Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, ii. 248 sqq.

¹⁰⁷ Comp. the treatises *Nidda* and *Sabim*.

¹⁰⁸ *Nedarim* ix. 1 (only R. Elieser permits it, but he stands alone). Comp. also Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge*, pp. 184–186. All attempts to explain away the testimony of Jesus, agreeing as it does with the Mishna, are in vain, *e.g.* von Rosenberg in Delitzsch's *Saat und Hoffnung*, 1875, pp. 37–40.

faces the heavy accusation of making clean the outside of the cup and platter, but being within full of extortion and excess. Like whited sepulchres, which indeed appeared beautiful without, but within are full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness, they also appeared righteous before men, but within were full of hypocrisy and iniquity (Matt. xxiii. 27, 28; Luke xi. 44). It would however be unjust to find in such words of rebuke, however well founded, a universal characteristic of the whole period. Justice requires us to mention, that many an excellent saying of the learned men of that age, affording proof, that all moral judgment was not stifled under the rubbish of Halachic discussions, has been preserved. We may recall perhaps the already mentioned exhortation of Antigonus of Socho, to be like servants, who do service without regard to reward,¹⁰⁹ or that of R. Elieser, not to make prayer ■ settled duty.¹¹⁰ Hillel's motto was, judge not thy neighbour till thou come into his place.¹¹¹ R. Elieser ben Hyrkanos said: Let your neighbour's honour be as dear to you as your own.¹¹² R. Jose ha-Kohen said: Let your neighbour's property be as dear to you as your own. He also said: Do all your acts in the name of God.¹¹³ R. Judah ben Tema said: Be bold as a leopard, light as an eagle, swift as a stag, and strong as a lion, to do the will of your Father in heaven.¹¹⁴

But when we look away from the single rays of light, and from the deeper shadows which form their contrast, we cannot better characterize the entire tendency of the Judaism of that period, than by the words of the apostle: "They have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. It was a fearful burden

¹⁰⁹ *Aboth* i. 3.¹¹⁰ *Berachoth* iv. 4. Comp. *Aboth* ii. 13.¹¹¹ *Aboth* ii. 4.¹¹² *Aboth* ii. 10.¹¹³ *Aboth* ii. 12.

¹¹⁴ *Aboth* v. 20. Comp. Saalschütz, *Archäologie der Hebräer*, i. 247 sqq. Weiss (*Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Tradition*, vol. i. 1871) has collected a number of Talmudic parallels to sayings of Christ, given also in German by Weber in Delitzsch's *Saat auf Hoffnung*, 1872, p. 89 sqq. So too has Duschak, *Die Moral der Evangelien und des Talmud*, Brünn 1877.

which a spurious legalism had laid upon the shoulders of the people. They bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders" (Matt. xxiii. 4; Luke xi. 46). Nothing was left to free personality, everything was placed under the bondage of the letter. The Israelite, zealous for the law, was obliged at every impulse and movement to ask himself, what is commanded? At every step, at the work of his calling, at prayer, at meals, at home and abroad, from early morning till late in the evening, from youth to old age, the dead, the deadening formula followed him. A healthy moral life could not flourish under such a burden, action was nowhere the result of inward motive, all was, on the contrary, weighed and measured. Life was a continual torment to the earnest man, who felt at every moment that he was in danger of transgressing the law; and where so much depended on the external form, he was often left in uncertainty whether he had really fulfilled its requirements. On the other hand, pride and conceit were almost inevitable for one who had attained to mastership in the knowledge and treatment of the law. He could indeed say that he had done his duty, had neglected nothing, had fulfilled all righteousness. But all the more certain is it, that this righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. v. 20), which looked down with proud thanks to God upon the sinner (Luke xviii. 9-14), and pompously displayed its works before the eyes of the world (Matt. vi. 2, xxiii. 5), was not that true righteousness which was well-pleasing to God.

29. THE MESSIANIC HOPE

THE LITERATURE.¹

- Schöttgen, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*, vol. ii. *De Messia*, 1742. (A work of eminent scholarship, but ruled by the effort to make the Rabbis into Christian theologians. Even the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum* is proved from Rabbinic works.)
- Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum Jesu apostolorumque aetate in compendium redacta observationibusque illustrata*. Erlangae 1811.
- Moraht, *De iis, quae ad cognoscendam Judaeorum Palaestinensium, qui Jesu tempore vivebant, Christologiam evangelia nobis exhibeant, deque locis messianis in illis allegatis*. Gotting. 1828.
- De Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments* (3rd ed. 1831), pp. 159–179. The same, *Commentatio de morte Jesu Christi expiatoria* (*Opuscula theologica*, 1830, pp. 1–148).
- Von Cölln, *Biblische Theologie*, vol. i. (1836), pp. 479–511.
- Mack, *Die messianischen Erwartungen und Ansichten der Zeitgenossen Jesu* (*Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.* 1836, pp. 3–56, 193–226).
- Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils* (also under the title, *Gesch. des Urchristenthums*, vols. i.–ii. 1838), ii. 195–444.
- Bauer (Bruno), *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker*, vol. i. 1841, pp. 391–416.
- Zeller, *On the Assertion that prae-Christian Judaism had no Messianic Dogmatic* (*Theol. Jahrb.* 1843, pp. 35–52).
- Hellwag, Baur, and Zeller's *Theol. Jahrb.* 1848, pp. 151–160 (in the article, On the notion of the pre-existence of Christ in the primitive Church).
- Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalypstik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. Jena 1857.
- Oehler, art. "Messias," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. ix. p. 408 sqq., 422–441. In the 2d ed. revised by Orelli, ix. 641 ff.

¹ See the older literature in Hase, *Leben Jesu*, § 34. De Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik* (3rd ed.), p. 163. Bretschneider, *Systematische Entwicklung aller in der Dogmatik vorkommenden Begriffe* (4th ed. 1841), p. 553 sqq.

- Colani, *Jésus-Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps*, 2nd ed. Strasbourg 1864, pp. 1-68.
- Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi*. Freiburg 1866, pp. 391-461.
- Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. v. (3rd ed. 1867) pp. 135-160.
- Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, vol. i. 1867, pp. 239-250.
- Holtzman, *Die Messiasidee zur Zeit Jesu (Jahrbb. für deutsche Theol.* 1867, pp. 389-411). The same in Weber and Holtzmann's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel* (1867), ii. 191-211.
- Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, vol. i. (2nd ed. 1873) pp. 165-176.
- Weiffenbach, *Quae Jesu in regno coelesti dignitas sit synopticorum sententia exponitur* (Gissae 1868), pp. 47-62.
- Ebrard, *Wissenschaftl. Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte* (3rd ed. 1868), pp. 835-849.
- Wittichen, *Die Idee des Reiches Gottes, dritter Beitrag zur biblischen Theologie insbesondere der synoptischen Reden Jesu* (Göttingen 1872), pp. 105-165.
- Anger, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der messianischen Idee*, edited by Krenkel (Berlin 1873), pp. 78-91.
- Castelli, *Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei*, Firenze 1874 (p. 358).
- Vernes, *Histoire des idées messianiques depuis Alexandre jusqu' à l'empereur Hadrien*, Paris 1874 (p. 294).
- Stähelin, *Jahr. für deutsch Theologie*, 1874, pp. 199-218 (in the article, *Zur paulinischen Eschatologie*).
- Schönefeld, *Ueber die messianische Hoffnung von 200 vor Christo bis gegen 50 nach Christo*, Jena 1874.
- Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah, a Critical History of the Messianic Idea among the Jews from the rise of the Maccabees to the closing of the Talmud*, London 1877 (p. 395).
- Stapfer, *Les idées religieuses en Palestine à l'époque de Jésus-Christ* (2nd ed. 1878), pp. 111-132.
- Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie aus Targum, Midrasch und Talmud dargestellt* (Leipzig 1880), pp. 322-386.
- Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), § 555, 556.
- Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. (1883), arts. "Messianische Leidenszeit," "Messias," "Messiasleiden," "Messias Sohn Joseph," "Messiaszeit" (pp. 735-779). Comp. also "Armilus," "Belebung der Todten," "Ewiges Leben," "Lohn und Strafe," "Paradies," "Vergeltung," "Zukunftsmahl."

Within the sphere of the religious ideas held by the Jewish people during the period with which we are occupied, two groups may be distinguished: (1) *General religious ideas*, with respect to the relation of man and of the world to God, and (2) *Specific Israelitish ideas*, which have for their object the relation of the Jewish people to Jahveh as the God of Israel. The latter are those which are the really prevailing ideas, they form the centre around which the others are grouped and to which they are related. These specific Israelitish ideas however received again their special tinge in later times from the legal view of the relation between Jahveh and Israel. The thought, that God had selected this one people for His possession and therefore bestowed His benefits upon them exclusively, was now supplemented by the other, that He had also given them a law, and thereby bound Himself to bestow His benefits under the presupposition, that they observed this law. Thus the maxim, *that God gave many commands and ordinances to the people of Israel for the purpose of providing them with much reward now formed the core of the religious consciousness.*^a Very simple observation however showed, that this reward was in present experience bestowed neither upon the nation as a whole, nor upon individuals, in the proportion to be expected. The more intensely therefore the consciousness of the nation and the individual was penetrated by this thought, the more must their gaze have been directed to the future, and the worse the state of the present, the more ardent must that gaze have been. Hence we may say, that in later times *the religious consciousness was concentrated upon the hope of the future.* The better future to be expected was the special object towards which all other religious ideas teleologically referred. As the *work* of the Israelite was virtually the observance of the law, so was his *faith* virtually belief in a better future. Round

^a *Makkoth* iii. 16.

these two poles (as we have already remarked, p. 93) did the religious life of the Jewish people revolve during our period. They were zealous for the law in order one day to obtain reward. This central position of the hope of the future in the religious consciousness of Israel justifies us in again specially directing our attention thereto.

I. RELATION TO THE OLDER MESSIANIC HOPE.

The hope of a better future was already with the prophets of the Old Testament an essential element of their religious consciousness. Nor was it ever entirely lost by the people, though it was not always as lively as it again became in an increasing degree after the Maccabaeon rising. In the course of time however this hope of the future experienced many changes. There was indeed far greater freedom of movement in the sphere of *faith* than in that of *action*. While legal precepts were binding to their very smallest details, and must therefore be handed down unaltered from one generation to another, comparatively freer play was permitted to faith, and provided certain fundamentals were adhered to, the individual need could here come forward more freely (see above, § 25. III. Halachah and Haggadah). Hence too the hope of the future was developed in very various manners. Still certain common *ground lines* may here be observed, *by which the later Messianic hope is on the average characteristically distinguished from the older*. The older Messianic hope virtually moves within the boundary of the then present circumstances of the world, and is nothing else than the hope of a better future for the *nation*. That the nation should be morally purified from all bad elements, that it should exist unmolested and respected in the midst of the Gentile world, whilst its enemies were either destroyed or forced to acknowledge the nation and

its God, that it should be governed by a just, wise and powerful king of the house of David, and that therefore internal justice, peace and happiness would prevail, nay that all natural evils would be abolished and a state of unclouded prosperity would appear—this may be said to have formed the foundation of the future hope among the older prophets. This picture however underwent very important alterations in the consciousness of a subsequent age, partly in the times of the later prophets, but especially in the post-canonical period.

1. And first, *the view became more and more extended from the nation to the world*: the eye was fixed not only on the future of the *nation*, but on the future of the *world*. While in the former vision the heathen nations were only objects of consideration, so far as they stood in some kind of relation to Israel, the expectation of after times fixed its gaze more and more decidedly upon the fate of all mankind, nay of the whole world. The *judgment* was originally a visitation by which either Israel was purified or its enemies destroyed; it subsequently became the judgment of the world, in which the fate of all men and all nations will be decided, and that either by God Himself or by His Anointed, the Messianic King of Israel. The ideal *kingdom* of the future does not, according to former expectation, extend beyond the actual limits of the Holy Land; according to the later view, the future kingdom of God comprises all mankind, who willingly or by compulsion are united under the sceptre of Israel into a universal monarchy. Thus the Messiah is the judge and ruler of the world. Nay even the irrational creation, heaven and earth, and therefore the whole universe in the strict sense, is transformed, the old destroyed and a new and glorious one made in its stead. This extension of the idea of the future was partly brought about by the extension of the political horizon. The more the small separate states

were absorbed by the great universal monarchies, the more obvious was it to view the ideal kingdom of the future also as a universal monarchy. After the overthrow of the last heathen universal monarchy God Himself assumes the sceptre and founds a universal kingdom, which He, the heavenly King, rules by means of His people. But still more important than the enlargement of the political horizon in the development of the Messianic idea, was the enlargement of the notion of God and of the view of the world in general. In the original view Jehovah is only the God and King of Israel. He is subsequently more and more decidedly and evidently regarded as the God and King of the world. With this again is connected the ever increasing hold upon the consciousness of the nation of "the world" as a single whole comprising all existence. The growing universalism of the expectation of the future was virtually conditioned by this enlargement of the religious consciousness in general.

2. With this enlargement of the future hope is combined however, on the other hand, *a far more decided reference of this hope to the individual*. This too is connected with the development of the religious consciousness in general. Originally Jehovah is the God of the nation, who directs with His mighty hand the woe or weal of the people. The lot of the individual was hardly thought of. But as the religious consciousness deepened, the individual could not but more and more feel himself the object of God's care. Each individual knew his fate to be in the hand of God, and was sure that God would not forsake him. The strengthening of this individual belief in providence gradually resulted in a more individual hope of the future. This was indeed comparatively very late, as it cannot be pointed to till the time of Daniel. The form in which it was first manifested was that of a *belief in the resurrection*. The pious Israelite being certain, ~~that~~ his personal and indeed his enduring and eternal

salvation is the will of God, expects, that he and all the godly will have a share in the future glory of the nation. He then who is seized by death before this is realized, may hope, that he will one day be raised up again by God and transplanted to the kingdom of His glory. According to this the object of the resurrection is a participation in the glorious future of the nation, and the basis of faith in the resurrection is the ever more powerfully developing interest of personal salvation. But not only did the interest of salvation take an individual form, but reflection was more and more directed to the future fate of the individual *in malam partem* also. God keeps in heaven an account of the deeds of each individual, at least of each Israelite. And decision will be given at the judgment on the ground of what is contained in these heavenly books, and reward or punishment meted to each exactly according to his merits. The result of this again was, that the expectation of a resurrection was now that of a general resurrection: not only were the righteous, but the unrighteous also to rise, to receive their sentence at the judgment. This expectation however never attained general acceptance, many looking only for a resurrection of the just. Lastly however the individual interest was no longer satisfied with a resurrection for the purpose of participation in the Messianic kingdom. This was no longer regarded as the ultimate and supreme felicity, but a higher, an eternal, a heavenly happiness expected afterwards, even an absolutely glorious state in heaven; as on the other hand for the wicked, not merely an exclusion from Messiah's kingdom, but eternal torment and punishment in hell.

3. These last particulars are already connected with a further peculiarity, by which the hope of the future entertained in later, is distinguished from that of older times; for it had now become *more and more transcendent*, and was more and more transferred to the supernatural and supermundane.

The older hope kept within the range of present circumstances. A destruction of the enemies of Israel, a purification of the people and their glorious future, were expected. However ideal the representation of this future prosperity, it still remains within the circle of present circumstances. In the later view the present and the future became more and more pure contrasts, the gulf between the two ever deeper, the view ever more dualistic. With the appearance of Messianic times a new course of the world, ■ new עולם, is to begin. This future course of the world (עולם הבא) is however in all respects the entire contrast to the present course of the world (עולם הזה). The present is under the rule of the ungodly powers of Satan and his angels, and therefore sunk in sin and sorrow. The future is under the rule of God and His Anointed: and only righteousness and happiness prevail therein. There can scarcely be any connection between the two. By a miraculous act of God the one will be destroyed, the other called into existence. However much this view may be supported by the former representation, the contrast between now and then is much more sharply drawn than in the former view. The latter sees far more the gracious government of God in the present time also. According to the later representation it might almost seem, as if God had for the present given over the government to the Satanic powers, and had reserved for the future world the full exercise of His sway. Accordingly the future salvation is also more and more regarded as purely transcendental. All the benefits of the future world come down from above, from heaven, where they had pre-existed from all eternity. They are kept there for the saints as an "inheritance," which will one day be bestowed upon them. In particular does the perfect, the glorious, new *Jerusalem*, which will at the time of the consummation of all things descend to earth in the place of the old, exist there already. So too *the Messiah*, the perfect

King of Israel, chosen by God from eternity, is already there in communion with God. All that is good and perfect can come only from above, because all that is earthly is in its present condition the direct contrary to the divine. At last therefore the hope of the future outsteps altogether the limits of earthly existence. The final happiness is not even found in the kingdom of glory upon the *renewed* earth, but in an absolute state of glory in heaven. As the salvation itself, so also is the manner of its realization more and more transcendently conceived of. The judgment is a forensic act, in which, without the intervention of earthly powers, the fate of men is decided simply by the verdict of God, or of His Anointed; and the execution of this sentence is effected only by supernatural powers, by a miraculous act of God, which destroys the old and calls the new order of things into existence.

4. Lastly, the Messianic hope received an entirely new colouring in later times from the fact that it, like the whole circle of religious ideas in general, was *increasingly dogmatized* by the diligent labour of the scribes. In place of vigorous religious productiveness came the learned investigation of the prophetic writings, by which the details of the Messianic picture of the future were dogmatically settled. The task of the scribes was indeed at first the settling and treatment of *the law*. But they then, according to the same method, worked at and settled in detail the whole circle of religious ideas, and especially the Messianic expectations. Thus the poetic picture became learned dogma. While in the ideal imagery of the prophets the boundary of the literal and figurative meaning is evidently a fluctuating one, the sacred text of the prophets is taken at its word by the scribes of a later age, the poetic image is stiffened into dogma, and the character of the whole picture of the future becomes thereby increasingly an externally transcendental one. Not only moreover were all the existing details collected and dogmatically arranged, but new details were elicited by its

learned combination, after the manner of Haggadic Midrash (see above, § 25. III.). For the sake of obtaining new disclosures, the most heterogeneous passages were with the utmost ingenuity brought into relation with each other, and the details of Messianic theology thereby more accurately and comprehensively determined. It cannot be denied however, that such learned material also fluctuated, for it never became really binding like the details of the law. Thus the individual was at liberty to appropriate now more now less of it, and to fashion it according to his own perceptions, so that the Messianic hope was always fluctuating and is met with in very different forms among different individuals.

It must moreover be also remarked, that the peculiarities of the later Messianic expectation here described are by no means equally found everywhere. Even in later times, *the old hope of a glorious future for the nation maintained the supremacy*. This forms even in the later view of the future the determining ground-plan of the picture. And just as upon this foundation the characteristic peculiarities of the later view have stronger or weaker influence, and produce this or that alteration, is the old image now more now less, now in one way now in another, specially modified and supplemented.

But did this hope, we would next inquire, always continue active among the people? Did it not itself die out with the dying out of ancient prophecy, and revive to new life through the Christian movement? The latter has been frequently asserted, especially so far as the Messianic idea in its *narrower* sense of the expectation of a Messianic King is concerned. It is thought, that this was again stirred up by the appearance of Jesus Christ, and that it was thereby revived even in the circles of Judaism. This assertion has been made in a summary manner by Bruno Bauer and Volkmar, in a more enlightened one and with better foundation by Holtzmann. The statements adduced by the latter are about these. After

the almost total extinction of the Messianic idea in the last centuries before Christ, it was reconstructed in the way of scholarship "by means of mere literary investigation." This process of new formation had in the time of Jesus been already entered upon, but did not receive its completion till the Christian period and under the partial influence of Christian ideas. The Messianic idea was in the time of Christ by no means an active one in the popular consciousness. An essential distinction between the later scholastic and the former prophetic idea of the Messiah was, that the prophets did not expect His appearance till after God Himself had in a decisive battle destroyed the hostile powers, while according to the later dogmatic the Messiah was to come to hold a judgment, and that a judgment in a forensic form. Setting aside for the present the latter point, we may sum up our verdict on Holtzmann's view by saying, that he is decidedly in the right, when he insists on the scholastic character of the later Messianic idea, but in the wrong, when he as good as denies the Messianic idea to the last centuries before Christ, and represents it as not yet transferred to popular consciousness during the life of Jesus. The latter is in opposition to the gospel history, and the former he can only maintain by either entirely disregarding evidence to the contrary (as Henoch, xc. 37-38; *Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 46-50; Philo, *de praem. et poen.* § 16), or casting doubt upon the time of its composition (as the *Psalterium Salomonis*), or explaining it away in an arbitrary manner (as *Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 652 sqq., which is said to relate to Simon the Maccabaeon). In truth the Messianic idea never quite died out, at least not in its more general form of the hope of a better future for the nation. In any case it was again very active in the last centuries before Christ, and especially in the time of Christ, as the course of the gospel history shows. It there appears as thoroughly alive among the people, without Jesus doing anything to revive it; and indeed it appears as a rule in the

last centuries before Christ, not only in its general form as the hope of a better future of the nation, but also in its special form as the hope of a Messianic King. This will appear as we present in the following pages: (1) *The development of the Messianic idea in its historical course*; and (2) give a *Systematic view of Messianic dogmatics*.

II. HISTORICAL SURVEY.

The prophecies of the Book of Daniel (about 167 to 165 before Christ) had a profound influence upon the form of the Messianic idea. In the time of the affliction (עַת צָרָה, xii. 1), which had come upon Israel by reason of the insane measures of Antiochus Epiphanes, the prophet predicts the approaching deliverance. God will Himself sit in judgment on the kingdoms of this world, and will take from them power and dominion, and root up and destroy them for ever. But "the saints of the Most High" will receive the kingdom and possess it for ever and ever. All peoples and nations and tongues will serve them, and their kingdom will never be destroyed (vii. 9-27, ii. 44). The righteous too who have fallen asleep will have their share in it; for they will awake from the dust of the earth to everlasting life, but the ungodly to everlasting contempt (xii. 2). Whether the author conceived of this kingdom of the saints of the Most High, as with a Messianic King at its head, cannot be made out, at any rate he makes no mention of him. For he, who appears in the form of a man (פֶּבֶר אָנֶשׁ, vii. 13), is by no means the personal Messiah, but, as the author plainly and expressly says in the interpretation, the people of the saints of the Most High (vii. 18, 22, 27). As the kingdoms of the world are represented by beasts, which rise up out of the sea, so is the kingdom of the saints represented by a human form, which descends from the clouds of heaven

The coming up out of the sea, *i.e.* the abyss, points to the anti-divine origin of the former, the coming from heaven to the divine origin of the latter. Thus the core of Daniel's Messianic hope is the *universal dominion of the saints* (see especially ii. 44, vii. 14, 27). And indeed the author does not, as might appear from chap. vii., conceive of this as brought about by a mere judicial sentence of God. On the contrary, he says expressly (ii. 44), that the kingdom of the saints shall "break in pieces and destroy," *i.e.* conquer by force of arms the world-kingsdoms, by the help indeed of God and according to His will. It is also deserving of attention, that in this book the hope in a resurrection of the body is for the first time plainly and decidedly expressed (xii. 2). Hence here as formerly, the Messianic hope is the hope of a glorious future for the nation, but with the double modification that the future kingdom of Israel is conceived of as a universal kingdom, and that all the saints who have died will share in it.

In the apocryphal books of the Old Testament³ the Messianic hope cannot, by reason of the historical or didactic nature of these books, be brought prominently forward. But it is by no means absent from them. Thus we find, in the Book of Ecclesiasticus, all the essential elements of the older Messianic hope, the expectation of penal judgment upon the heathen (Ecclus. xxxii. 18, 19, xxxiii. 1 sqq.), the deliverance of Israel from their troubles (Ecclus. i. 24), the gathering of the dispersed (xxxiii. 11), the everlasting duration of the nation (xxxvii. 25, xl. 13), nay, the everlasting duration of the Davidic dynasty (xlvii. 11). In the other apocryphal books too, we meet first one and then another element: that God will judge the heathen (Judith xvi. 17), and gather the dis-

³ Comp. De Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik*, p. 160 sq. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* vol. ix. pp. 422-425 (2nd ed. ix. pp. 653-655). Anger, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Messianischen Idee*, pp. 78 sq., 84 sq. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 196 sqq.

persed of Israel into one nation again (2 Macc. ii. 18; Bar. ii. 27–35, iv. 36, 37, v. 5–9); that the people shall be established for ever (2 Macc. xiv. 15), and that the throne of David shall be an eternal one (1 Macc. ii. 57). The author of the Book of Tobit hopes, not only that the righteous will be gathered, the nation of Israel exalted, and Jerusalem rebuilt in the most splendid manner with gold and precious stones (Tob. xiii. 12–18, xiv. 7), but also, in common with certain prophets of the Old Testament, that all the heathen will be converted to God (Tob. xiii. 11, xiv. 6, 7). In the Hellenistic Wisdom of Solomon the national element is, as may be conceived, in the background, nay the author cannot, by reason of his Platonistic anthropology, expect true happiness for the soul till after death. With him therefore the important element is, that the *righteous dead* will one day sit in judgment upon the heathen (Wisd. iii. 8, v. 1; comp. 1 Cor. vi. 2 sq.). The explanation of the just man in Wisd. ii. 12–20 as the Messiah, which is prevalent in older exegesis, is utterly unfounded.⁴

The stream of Messianic prediction flows forth in copious abundance in the oldest Jewish *Sibyllines*, which appeared about 140 B.C. *Sibyll.* iii. 286 sq. must not indeed be referred to these (*Καὶ τότε δὴ θεὸς οὐρανόθεν πέμψει βασιλῆα, Κρινεῖ δ' ἄνδρα ἕκαστον ἐν αἵματι καὶ πυρὸς αὐγῇ*), where on the contrary Cyrus is spoken of.⁵ Nor can the *υἱὸς θεοῦ*, iii. 775, be appealed to. For according to the correct supposition of Alexandre, we must read *νηόν* instead of *υἷόν*. And lastly, it is quite a mistake to understand by the *κόρη*, in whom, according to *Sibyll.* iii. 748–786, God will dwell, the mother

⁴ Comp. Reusch, Is Wisd. ii. 12–20 a Messianic prediction? (*Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.* 1864, pp. 330–346).

⁵ As even Hilgenfeld now admits (*Zeitschr. für w. Th.* 1871, p. 36), after having formerly disputed it (*Apokalyptik*, p. 64; *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 315).

of Messiah (an explanation into which, following Langen,⁶ even Weiffenbach⁷ suffered himself to be seduced). For the *κόρη*, Hebr. *הַיְהוּדָה*, is nothing else than Jerusalem. Still after the withdrawal of all these passages, it remains certain, that the whole section, *Sibyll.* iii. 652–794, is of almost exclusively Messianic purport, although only a short mention of the Messianic King is made at the beginning. From the east (*ἀπ' ἡελίοιο*), it is here said, will God send a king, who will put an end to all war upon earth, killing some, and fulfilling the promises to others. And he will do this not according to his own counsel, but in obedience to the commands of God.⁸ At his appearance (for this is certainly the meaning of the author), the kings of the heathen assemble once more for an attack upon the temple of God and the Holy Land. They offer their idolatrous sacrifices round about Jerusalem. But God will speak to them with a mighty voice, and they will all perish by the hand of the Immortal. The earth will quake and the mountains and hills be overturned, and Erebus will appear. The heathen nations will perish by war, sword and fire, because they lifted their spears against the temple (663–697). Then will the children of God live in peace and quietness, because the hand of the Holy One protects them (698–709). And the heathen nations seeing this will be encouraged to bless and praise God, to send gifts to His temple and to accept His law, because it is the most just in all the world (710–726). Peace will then prevail among all the kings of the earth

⁶ *Das Judenthum in Palästina*, p. 401 sqq.

⁷ *Quae Jesu in regno coelesti dignitas sit*, p. 50 sq.

⁸ *Sibyll.* iii. 652–656 :—

Καὶ τότε ἀπ' ἡελίοιο θεὸς πέμψει βασιλῆα,
 Ὃς πᾶσαν γαῖαν παύσει πολέμοιο κακοῖο,
 Οὓς μὲν ἄρα κτείνας, οἷς δ' ὄρκια πιστὰ τελέσσει.
 Οὐδέ γε ταῖς ἰδίαις βουλαῖς τάδε πάντα ποιήσει,
 Ἀλλὰ θεοῦ μεγάλιοι πιθήσας δόγμασιν ἰσθλοῖς.

(743-760). And God will set up an *eternal kingdom over all men*. Men will bring offerings to the temple of God from all parts of the earth. The prophets of God will lay down the sword, for they are judges of men and just kings. And God will dwell upon Zion and universal peace will prevail upon earth (766-794). The writer lays the chief stress, as we see, upon the circumstance, that the law of God will attain recognition and validity among all the nations of the earth, but he expects not this alone, but the setting up of a universal kingdom over all mankind (766-767: βασιλείου εἰς αἰῶνας πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους) with Jerusalem as its theocratic centre. It is only at the beginning that he thinks of the king sent from God as the instrument for the establishment of the universal peace. But he is undoubtedly to be thought of as the intervening cause, when it is said, ver. 689, that God exterminates the attacking heathen by war and sword (πολέμῳ ἡδὲ μαχαίρῃ). And if the prophets of God (θεοῦ μεγάλοι προφήται, i.e. indeed the Israelites, the saints of the Most High as they are called in Daniel) are only generally spoken of as judges and kings (780-781), still a theocratic king at their head is at least not excluded by the words of the author. It is in any case worthy of remark, that even an Alexandrian, when painting the future, cannot dispense with the God-sent king.

The original portion of the Book of Enoch (in the last third of the 2nd century before Christ) contains comparatively little that is Messianic. It is the conclusion of the vision of Judgment (c. 90. 16-38), which is here chiefly to be considered. The author expects in the first place a last powerful attack of the heathen (here chiefly the Syrian) power, which is however rendered vain by the miraculous intervention of God (90. 16-19). A throne is then erected in the delightful land and God sits in judgment. First the fallen angels and then the apostate Jews are cast into the fiery pit (90. 20-27).

Then the old Jerusalem (for the "house" is Jerusalem) is done away with, and God brings a new Jerusalem and places it on the spot where the old one stood (90. 28-29). In this new Jerusalem dwell the pious Jews, and the heathen do them homage (90. 30). Hereupon the Messiah appears (under the image of a white bullock), and all the heathen pray to Him and are converted to God (90. 37-38). The transcendent character of the later Messianic idea here comes forward: the new Jerusalem has nothing in common with the old, but is brought from heaven in a miraculous manner.

We meet with the Messianic King depicted in sharper outlines and fuller colours in the *Psalterium Salomonis*, composed in the time of Pompey (63-48 B.C.). These Psalms are instructive, if only because their author dwells both upon God Himself being the King of Israel (xvii. 1), and David's house never becoming extinct before God (xvii. 5). Hence it must not be concluded, without further ceremony, that when the former takes place, the latter is excluded. The longing for the Davidic king is especially ardent in the author, for Jerusalem had, in his time, fallen under the heathen rule of the Romans, and no hope for the future could be built upon the Sadducean-minded dynasty of the Asmonaeans. Hence he hopes, that God will raise up a prince of the house of David to rule over Israel, to crush their enemies, and to cleanse Jerusalem from the heathen (xvii. 23-27). He will gather a holy people, and will judge the tribes of the nation, and not suffer unrighteousness in their midst, he will divide them in the land according to their tribes, and no stranger shall dwell among them (xvii. 28-31). The heathen nations will serve him and will come to Jerusalem, to bring the wearied children of Israel as gifts and to see the glory of the Lord. He is a righteous king and one taught of God (xvii. 32-35). And there is no unrighteousness in his days, for all are saints. And their

king is the Lord's anointed.⁹ He will not place his trust in horse or rider. For the Lord Himself is his King. And he will strike the earth with the word of his mouth for ever (xvii. 36-39). He will bless the people of the Lord with wisdom; and he is pure from sin; and he will rule over a great people and not be weak. For God makes him strong by His Holy Spirit. He will lead them all in holiness, and there is no pride among them (xvii. 40-46). This is the beauty of the king of Israel. Happy are they, who are born in his days (xvii. 47-51). The writer expects, as it appears, not godly kings in general of David's house, but a single Messiah endowed by God with miraculous powers, pure from sin and holy (xvii. 41, 46), whom God has made powerful and wise by the Holy Spirit (xvii. 2), and who therefore strikes his enemies not with external weapons, but with the word of his mouth (xvii. 39 after Isa. xi. 4). He is however, notwithstanding such idealism, represented as quite a worldly ruler, as an actual king of Israel. Comp. generally, Ps. xviii. 6-10, and especially Ps. xi. (the gathering of the dispersed) and iii. 16, xiv. 2 sqq. (the resurrection of the just).

As the oppression of the Pompeian period was the occasion of the Psalter of Solomon, so also was the despotism of Antony and Cleopatra that of a more recent Sibylline piece (*Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 36-92). When Rome had then obtained dominion over Egypt also, the Sibyllist expected the appearance of the kingdom of God on earth and the coming of a holy king to rule for ever over every land. The passage in question (iii. 46-50) is as follows:—

Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ 'Ρώμη καὶ Αἰγύπτου βασιλεύσει,
Εἰς ἐν ἰθύνουσα, τότε δὴ βασιλεία μεγίστη

⁹ Χριστὸς κύριος, xvii. 36, like Lam. iv. 20, is a wrong translation for הָיָה יְהוָה. The correct Χριστὸς κυρίου is found xviii. 8. Comp. also xviii. 6.

Ἀθανάτου βασιλῆος ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισι φανείται.

Ἡξει δ' ἀγνὸς ἄναξ, πάσης γῆς σκῆπτρα κρατήσων

Εἰς αἰῶνας πάντας, ἐπειγομένοιο χρόνοιο.

The immortal King, whose kingdom is to appear among men, is of course God Himself. On the other hand, none other than the Messiah can be meant by the ἀγνὸς ἄναξ, who is to possess the sceptre of every kingdom. Here too, as in the Psalter of Solomon, we find the personal Messiah and the idea of the kingdom of God in direct combination.

If in the Psalter of Solomon the form of the Messianic King is already one far surpassing the ordinary human form, this feature comes out more strikingly in the figurative discourses of the Book of Enoch (chap. xxxvii.—lxxi.). The image of the Messiah is here chiefly drawn, in continuation of the Book of Daniel, by "the Son of man" being understood of the person of Messiah, and the coming from heaven taken literally; pre-existence being therefore ascribed to the Messiah. But unfortunately the date of the composition of this book is so uncertain, that we must renounce its insertion in the historical development. Use can only be made of it for the systematic survey.

The *Assumptio Mosis*, of about the beginning of the Christian era, predicts in words of beautiful aspiration the approach of the kingdom of God. The author, after bringing into view a time of tribulation such as that under Antiochus Epiphanes, continues, chap. x.: "Then will his kingdom appear among all creatures, and the devil will have an end, and sorrow will disappear with him. Then will the Heavenly One arise from the seat of his kingdom and will come from his holy habitation with wrath and anger for his children's sake, and the earth will tremble to its ends, and the high mountains be lowered, and the hills fall. The sun will give no light, and the moon be changed into blood (comp. Joel iii. 4), and the

stars fall into confusion. And the sea will retreat to the abyss, and the water-springs fail, and the rivers be dried up. Then will the most High God, the alone Eternal, come forth to chastise the heathen and destroy all idols. Then wilt thou be happy, O Israel, and wilt tread upon the neck and wings of the eagle. And God will exalt thee and make thee soar to the firmament, and thou wilt thence look down upon thine enemies on earth, and shalt see them and rejoice, and give thanks and acknowledge thy Creator." That in this magnificent picture of the future there should be no mention of the Messianic King, is certainly not accidental, if it is the case that the author belonged to the party of the Zealots (see below, § 32). This circumstance would then, as Wieseler justly remarks,¹⁰ be explained by the fact, that the author's ideal would be, not a monarchic, but, if we may use the expression, a democratically constituted kingdom of God.

Equally without mention of a Messianic King, and on the whole in merely general outlines, does the *Book of Jubilees* describe the time of joy and delight, which will appear for Israel on their repentance.¹¹ "The days will begin to increase, and the children of men will be older from generation to generation and from day to day, till the length of their life approaches a thousand years. And there will be none old or weary of life, but they will all be like children and youths, and will pass and live all their days in peace and joy, without there being any Satan or other evil spoiler; for all their days will be days of blessing and healing. At that time will the Lord heal His servants, and they will arise and see ever deeper peace and pursue again their enemies. And they will see it and give thanks, and rejoice for evermore. And they will see all the judgments and all the curse of their enemies. Their bones will indeed rest in the earth, but their spirits will have many joys, and they

¹⁰ *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1868, p. 645.

¹¹ Ewald's *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft*, 3rd year, p. 24.

will perceive, that it is the Lord who sits in judgment and shows grace to hundreds and thousands and to all who love Him." While it is here said only in general, that the servants of the Lord "will again pursue their enemies," in another passage the *dominion of the world* is promised to the seed of Jacob.¹² God said to Jacob: "I am the Lord thy God, who made heaven and earth. I will cause thee to grow and will greatly increase thee; and kings shall proceed from thee and shall rule everywhere, even wherever the foot of the children of men shall tread. And I will give to thy seed the whole earth, which is under heaven, and they shall rule according to their choice over all nations; and afterwards they shall draw the whole earth to themselves and inherit it to eternity."

It is very characteristic testimony to the intensity of the Messianic hope in the age of Jesus Christ, that even a moralist like Philo should depict the happiness to be expected by the righteous, in the frame and with the colouring of Jewish national expectations.¹³ Two passages of his work "on the reward of the good and the punishment of the wicked" come in this respect especially under consideration (*De execrationibus*, § 8-9, ed. Mang. ii. 435 sq., and *De præmiis et poenis*, § 15-20, ed. Mang. ii. 421-428). In the former passage he expresses the hope, that all Israelites, or rather all who are converted to the law of God (for it depends on this and not on natural descent from Abraham), will be gathered in the Holy Land. "Though they should be in the ends of the earth as slaves among their enemies, who have taken them captive, yet will they all be set at liberty at a given sign on one day, because their sudden turning to virtue astonishes their masters.

¹² Ewald's *Jahrbücher*, iii. 42.

¹³ Comp. on the Messianic idea in Philo, Gfrörer, *Philo und die Alexandrinische Theosophie*, i. 495-534. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie*, i. 432-438. J. G. Müller, *Die messianischen Erwartungen des Juden Philo*. Basel 1870 (25, p. 4).

For they will release them because they are ashamed of bearing rule over their betters. When then this unexpected freedom is bestowed on those, who were before scattered in Hellas and in barbarous countries, on islands and on the continent, they will hasten with one impulse from all quarters to the place pointed out to them, led by a Divine superhuman appearance, which, invisible to all others, is visible only to the delivered.¹⁴ . . . When then they have arrived, the ruined cities will be rebuilt, and the desert reinhabited, and the barren land become fertile." In the other passage (*De praeemiis et poenis*, § 15 sqq., Mang. ii. 421 sqq.), Philo describes the time of prosperity and peace, which will appear when men turn to God. Before all they will be safe from wild beasts. "Bears, lions, panthers, Indian elephants, tigers and all kinds of beasts of uncontrollable strength and power will turn from their solitary ways of life to one according to law, and from intercourse with few, after the manner of gregarious animals, will accustom themselves to the sight of man, who will not as formerly be attacked by them, but feared as their master, and they will respect him as their natural lord. Some even, emulating the tame animals, will offer him their homage by wagging their tails like lap-dogs. The race too of scorpions, snakes and other reptiles will then no longer have any harmful poison" (§ 15). A further blessing of this time is peace among men. "Then says the prophecy (LXX. Num. xxiv. 7) a man who goes to battle and makes war shall go forth and subdue great and populous nations, God Himself sending help to His saints. This consists in unshaken boldness of mind and invincible strength of body, qualities each of which singly is terrible to enemies, but which when combined nothing

¹⁴ ξαναγούμενοι πρὸς τινος θειοτέρας ἢ κατὰ φύσιν ἀνθρωπίνης ὄψεως, αἰδήλου μὲν ἑτέροις, μόνοις δὲ τοῖς ἀνασσαζομένοις ἐμφανοῦς. That this divine appearance is not the Messiah, but one analogous to the pillar of fire in the march through the desert, scarcely needs mention.

is able to resist. But some of the enemies are, as the prophecy says, not even worthy to perish by the hand of man. Against them He (God) will send swarms of wasps, who fight to a shameful overthrow for the saints. But these (instead of *τούτων* we must read *τούτους*, i.e. the saints) will not only have certain victory in battle without bloodshed, but also invincible power of government for the welfare of their subjects, who will submit from either love, fear, or reverence. For they (the saints) possess three qualities, which are the greatest, and which found an indestructible dominion. Holiness, great power and benevolence (*σεμνότητα καὶ δεινότητα καὶ εὐεργεσίαν*), the first of which produces reverence, the second fear, the third love, but if they are harmoniously combined in the soul, they produce subjects, who are obedient to their rulers" (§ 16). Philo next mentions riches and prosperity (§ 20), health and strength of body, as blessings of Messianic times (§ 17-18). It is evident, that notwithstanding his efforts always to lay the chief emphasis on the ethic, he was not able to avoid popular notions. For he too expected, after the realization of the ethic ideal, a time of external prosperity and happiness for the pious and virtuous, one feature of which would be, that they should have dominion upon earth. Nor was the Messianic King absent from this image. For who else than he could be intended by the man, who goes to battle, carries on war and subdues great and populous nations? And the less such a God-sent hero is required by Philo's fundamental view, the more worthy of remark is it, that he is nevertheless included in his description of the Messianic age.

But even apart from such evidence, it is already plain from the *New Testament*, that the Messianic idea was anything but extinct in the popular consciousness in the period before Christ. We easily see from the question of John: "Art Thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" (Matt. xi. 3;

Luke vii. 19–29), that the coming One was expected. And the whole course of the gospel history—to mention only Peter's confession (Matt. xvi. 13 sqq.; Mark viii. 27 sqq.; Luke ix. 18 sqq.)—clearly shows that Jesus in acknowledging Himself to be the Messiah, was only connecting Himself with existing ideas. He by no means aimed in the first place at the revival and animation of Messianic hopes. And yet we find, that at His entry into Jerusalem, the whole multitude hailed Him as the Messiah (Matt. xxi.; Mark xi.; Luke xix.; John xii.). Such scenes are only to be explained on the assumption, that the Messianic hope was, before His appearance, already active in the nation.

This also needs no proof for the period after Christ. *The numerous popular tumults of a politico-religious kind, which took place in the time of the Roman procurators (A.D. 44–66), give sufficient evidence of the feverish tension, with which a miraculous intervention of God in history and the appearance of His kingdom on earth were expected.* How else could men such as Theudas the Egyptian have found believers for their promises by hundreds and thousands? Even Josephus superabundantly confesses, that the Messianic hope was one of the most powerful levers in the great insurrection against Rome. He himself did not indeed shrink from applying the Messianic prophecies to Vespasian, and in this respect he found approving faith from Tacitus and Suetonius.¹⁵

¹⁵ On the Messianic notions of Josephus, see Gerlach, *Die Weissagungen des Alten Testaments in den Schriften des Flavius Josephus* (1868), pp. 41–89. Langen in the *Tüb. Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1865, pp. 39–51. The passage in question in *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 4 is as follows: Τὸ δὲ ἐπαῖραν αὐτοὺς μάλιστα πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἦν χρησμὸς ἀμφίβολος ὁμοίως ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὐρημένους γράμμασιν, ὡς κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας τις αὐτῶν ἀρξεί τῆς οἰκουμένης. Τοῦτο οἱ μὲν ὡς οἰκεῖον ἐξέλαβον, καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν σοφῶν ἐπλανήθησαν περὶ τὴν κρίσιν· ἐδήλου δ' ἄρα τὴν Οὐεσπατιανοῦ τὸ λόγιον ἡγεμονίαν, ἐποδειχθέντος ἐπὶ Ἰουδαίας αὐτοκράτορος. Comp. Tacit. *Hist.* v. 13: Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore ut valesceret oriens profectique Judaea rerum potirentur. Quae ambages

On the state of the Messianic hope after the destruction of the temple, and during the last decades of the first century after Christ, we have copious information in the Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra. The *Apocalypse of Baruch* describes the course of the last things as follows: A time of general and terrible confusion will first of all occur. Men will mutually hate and fight against each other. The disreputable will rule over the respectable, the base will be exalted above the illustrious, the ungodly above heroes. And the nations (whom God has previously prepared for the purpose—we cannot but think of Gog and Magog) will come and fight against the princes who remain. And it will come to pass, that he who escapes from war, will perish by the earthquake, and he who escapes this, by fire, and he who escapes the fire, by famine. And he who escapes all these ills will be delivered into the hands of the Messiah (lxx. 2–10). For he will be manifested, and destroy the hosts of the last universal kingdom. And the last prince, who is left, will be chained and brought to Zion, and the Messiah will convict him of ungodliness and put him to death (xxxix. 7–40, 2). The Messiah will gather the nations, and to some he will grant life, and others he will destroy with the sword. He will grant life to those who have submitted to the seed of Jacob. But those who have oppressed Israel will be destroyed (lxxii. 2–6). Then will he sit upon the throne of his kingdom for ever;¹⁶ and peace will appear,

Vespasianum ac Titum praedixerant; sed vulgus more humanae cupidinis sibi tantam factorum magnitudinem interpretati ne adversis quidem ad vera mutabantur. Sueton. *Vesp.* c. 4: Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judaea profecti rerum potirentur. Id de imperatore Romano, quantum postea eventu paruit, praedictum Judaei ad se trahentes rebellarunt. It is hardly to be doubted, that Tacitus and Suetonius drew, whether directly or indirectly, entirely from Josephus. Comp. Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* i. 1, p. 51. This is disputed by Keim in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. xvii. 164 (art. "Vespasianus").

¹⁶ Cap. lxxiii. 1: Et sedebit in pace in aeternum super throno regni sui. xl. 3: Et erit principatus ejus stans in saeculum, donec finiatur mundus

and sorrow and tribulation depart from mankind, and joy prevail over the whole earth. And the wild beasts shall come and serve men, and vipers and serpents shall be subject to children. And the reapers shall not be faint, nor the builders weary (lxxiii.-lxxiv.; comp. xl. 2, 3). And the earth shall yield her fruits a thousandfold, and on one vine there shall be a thousand branches, and on one branch a thousand clusters, and on one cluster a thousand grapes, and one grape will yield a cor of wine.¹⁷ And manna will again fall from heaven, and it shall be again eaten in those days (xxix. 5-8). And after the end of that time all the dead will arise, the just and the unjust, in the same bodily form which they formerly had. Then will judgment be held. And after the judgment the risen will be changed. The bodies of the just will be transfigured in brightness, but those of the unjust will dwindle and become uglier than before. And they will be given up to torment. But the just will behold the invisible world, and will dwell in the high places of that world. And Paradise spreads out before them, and they see the hosts of angels who stand before the throne of God. And their glory is greater than that of the angels (chap. xxx., l., and li.; comp. xlv. 15).

The eschatological expectations of the fourth Book of Esdras agree in all essential points with those of Baruch. He too predicts first a time of fearful want and distress (v. 1-13, vi. 18-28, ix. 1-12, xiii. 29-31). After this the Messiah, the Son of God, will be revealed, and it will come to pass, that when the nations hear His voice they will forget war amongst each other, and will assemble in an innumerable multitude for an attack against the anointed. But he will stand upon Mount Zion, and will convict them of their ungodliness,

corruptionis. From the last passage it appears that the reign of Messiah is not to last "for ever" in the strict sense, but only to the end of the present world.

¹⁷ Comp. Papias in *Irenaeus*, v. 33. 3.

and destroy them by the law without battle and without weapons (xiii. 25-28, 32-38 ; comp. xii. 31-33). Then will the hidden city (viz. New Jerusalem) appear (vii. 26); and the ten tribes will return to the Holy Land (xiii. 39-47). And the anointed will protect and rejoice the people of God in the Holy Land, and show them many miracles for *four hundred years* (vii. 27, 28, xii. 34, xiii. 48-50 ; comp. ix. 8). And after this the anointed and all men who have breath will die. And the world will again return to the silence of death for seven days, as at the beginning. And after seven days a world which now sleeps will awake, and the corrupt world will perish. And the earth will restore those who sleep in it ; and the receptacles will give back the souls committed to them (vii. 29-32). And the Most High will appear upon the judgment-seat, and long-suffering will have an end ; only judgment will remain, and the reward come to light (vii. 33-35). And the place of torment will be revealed, and opposite to it the place of rest ; the pit of hell, and opposite to it Paradise. And the Most High will say to the risen : Behold Him whom you denied and did not honour, and whose commands you did not obey. Here is joy and delight, there is fire and torment. And the length of the day of judgment will be a week of years (vi. 1-17, according to the computation of the Ethiopic translation ; comp. also vv. 59 and 68-72, ed. Fritzsche, in Bensley, *The Missing Fragment*, etc. 1875, pp. 55-58, 64, 69 sq.).

Thus the two Apocalypses. That their hopes are not those of individuals, but form an essential element of Jewish consciousness is still shown by the Shemoneh Esreh, the daily prayer of the Israelites, which received its present form about A.D. 100. As it has been fully given above (p. 85 sq.), we need here only recall that in the 10th petition the gathering of the dispersed, in the 11th the reinstitution of the native authorities, in the 14th the rebuilding of Jerusalem, in the

15th the sending of the son of David and the setting up of his kingdom, and lastly, in the 17th, the restoration of the sacrificial worship at Jerusalem, are prayed for. Such was the hope and prayer of every Israelite after the destruction of the Jewish polity.¹⁸

We have in this survey purposely passed over the Targums, in which "King Messiah" frequently appears.¹⁹ For the opinion, that the older Targums originated in the time of Jesus Christ, may now be regarded as given up. They probably belong to the third or fourth century after Christ, at any rate, there is no proof of their greater antiquity, though they often fall back upon older exegetical traditions. Their case is the same as that of the other rabbinical works (the Mishna, Talmud, and Midrash), viz. that they are based upon older materials, but do not in their existing form belong to the period of which we are treating. The essential outlines of the Messianic hope of Judaism in this later time (about the beginning of the third century) are very well summed up by the author of the *Philosophumena*, who describes them in the following manner:²⁰ they say that the Messiah will proceed

¹⁸ The prayer for the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the restoration of the Aboda (the sacrificial service) occurs also in the Paschal Liturgy, *Pesachim* x. 6.

¹⁹ See in Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 1268–1273, a list of passages in the Targums applying to the Messiah. Comp. also Im. Schwarz, *Jesus Targumicus*, 2 parts, 4. Torgau 1758–59. Ayerst, *לְמַשְׁכָּן הַקֹּדֶשׁ*, the hope of Israel, or the doctrine of the ancient Jews concerning the Messiah, as stated in the Targums, p. 52. Langen, *Das Judenth. in Palästina*, pp. 418–429.

²⁰ *Philosophum.* ix. 30: Γένεσιν μὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ [scil. τοῦ Χριστοῦ] ἐσομένην λέγουσιν ἐκ γένους Δαβὶδ, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ παρθένου καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ἀλλ' ἐκ γυναικὸς καὶ ἀνδρός, ὡς πᾶσιν ὅρος γεννησθαι ἐκ σπέρματος, Φάσκοντες τοῦτον ἐσόμενον βασιλεῖα ἐπ' αὐτούς, ἄνδρα πολεμιστὴν καὶ δυνατὸν, ὃς ἐπισυνάξας τὸ πᾶν ἔθνος Ἰουδαίων, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πολεμήσας, ἀναστήσει αὐτοῖς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ πόλιν βασιλίδι, εἰς ἣν ἐπισυνάξει ἅπαν τὸ ἔθνος καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀρχαῖαις ἔθνη ἀποκαταστήσει βασιλεῦον καὶ ἱερατεῦον καὶ κατοικοῦν ἐν πεπονηθείῃ ἐν χρόνοις ἱκανοῖς· ἔπειτα ἐπαναστήναι κατ' αὐτῶν πόλεμον ἐπισυναρχθέντων· ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ πολέμῳ πεισὶν τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν μαχαίρῃ, ἔπειτα μετ' οὐ πολὺ τὴν συντέλειαν καὶ ἐκπύρωσιν τοῦ παντός· ἐπιστῆναι, καὶ οὕτως τὰ περὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν

from the house of David, not from a virgin and the Holy Ghost, but from a man and woman, as it is appointed to all to be born from seed. He will, they believe, be king over them, a warlike and powerful man, who will gather together the whole nation of the Jews, and carry on war with all nations, and build Jerusalem as a royal city for the Jews, in which he will assemble the whole nation, putting it into its old condition as a ruling and a sacrifice-offering nation, which will long dwell in safety. Afterwards war will arise against them collectively, and in this war the Messiah will fall by the sword. Not long after will follow the end and the conflagration of the world, and then will be fulfilled that which is believed with respect to the resurrection, and retribution be done to every one according to his works.

III. SYSTEMATIC STATEMENT.

We supplement this historical survey by giving also in the following pages a *systematic statement* of Messianic doctrinal theology on the foundation of the Shema, as resulting from the Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Esdras. For the eschatological expectation is most fully developed in these two Apocalypses.

1. *The last tribulation and perplexity.*²¹ Almost everywhere when the last things are referred to, the thought recurs with different variations, that the appearance of redemption must be preceded by a period of special trouble and affliction.

δοξαζόμενα ἐπιτελεσθῆναι, τὰς τε ἀμοιβὰς ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ πεπραγμένα ἀποδοθῆναι.

²¹ Comp. Schoettgen, *Horae Hebraicae*, ii. 509 sqq., 550 sqq. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 45–54. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 225 f., 300–304. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* ix. 436 f. (2nd ed. ix. 666). Renan, *L'Antichrist*. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, art. "Messianische Leidenszeit" (pp. 735–738).

It was indeed in itself an obvious thought, that the path to happiness should pass through tribulation. This was also expressly predicted in the Old Testament (Hos. xiii. 13; Dan. xii. 1, and elsewhere); and thus was formed in Rabbinical theology, the doctrine of the *הַבִּלְיָ הַמָּשִׁיחַ*, the travail of the Messiah, which must precede His birth, *i.e.* His appearing (the expression according to Hos. xiii. 13; comp. Matt. xxiv. 8: *πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἀρχὴ ὀδίνων*; Mark xiii. 9: *ἀρχαὶ ὀδίνων ταῦτα*). The threatening troubles will be announced by omens of all kinds. The sun and moon will be darkened, swords appear in heaven, trains of horse and foot march through the clouds (*Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 795–807; comp. 2 Macc. v. 2, 3. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 3. Tacit. *Hist.* v. 13). Everything in nature falls into commotion and confusion. The sun appears by night, the moon by day. Blood trickles from wood, the stone gives forth a voice, and salt is found in fresh water (4 Ezra v. 1–13). Places that have been sown will appear as unsown, full barns be found empty, and the springs of the wells be stopped (4 Ezra vi. 18–28). Among men all the restraints of order will be dissolved, sin and ungodliness rule upon earth. And men will fight against each other as if stricken with madness, the friend against the friend, the son against the father, the daughter against the mother. Nation will rise against nation, and to war shall be added earthquakes, fire, and famine, whereby men shall be carried off (*Book of Jubilees* in Ewald's *Jahrb.* vol. iii. p. 23 sq. Apocal. Baruch lxx. 2–8; 4 Ezra vi. 24, ix. 1–12, xiii. 29–31; Mishna, *Sota* ix. 15).²²

²² Mishna, *Sota* ix. 15, according to Jost's translation, is as follows: "As traces of the approach of Messiah are to be regarded, that arrogance increases, ambition shoots up, that the vine yields fruit and yet wine is dear. The government turns to heresy. There is no instruction. The place of assembly (the synagogue) is devoted to lewdness. Galilee is destroyed. Gablan laid waste. The inhabitants of a district go from city to city, without finding compassion. The wisdom of the learned is hated, the godly despised, truth is absent. Boys insult old men, old men stand in the presence of children. The son depreciates the father, the daughter rebels

Comp. also Matt. xxiv. 7–12, 21; Mark xiii. 9; Luke xxi. 23; 1 Cor. vii. 26; 2 Tim. iii. 1.

2. *Elijah as the forerunner.*²³ The return of the prophet Elijah to prepare the way of the Messiah was expected on the ground of Mal. iii. 23, 24. This view is already taken for granted in the Book of Ecclesiasticus (xlvi. 10, 11). It is, as is well known, frequently alluded to in the New Testament (see especially Matt. xvii. 10; Mark ix. 11; also Matt. xi. 14, xvi. 14; Mark vi. 15, viii. 28; Luke ix. 8, 19; John i. 21). It was even transferred to the Christian circle of ideas.²⁴ According to Mal. iii. 24, the object of his mission is chiefly considered to be, to make peace upon earth and in general to substitute order for disorder (Matt. xvii. 11: ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα; Mark ix. 12: ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα). The chief passage in the Mishna is as follows:²⁵ “R. Joshua said: I received the tradition from R. Johanan ben Sakkai, who received it from his teacher as a tradition in a direct line from Moses at Mount Sinai, that Elias would not come to

against the mother, the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law. A man's enemies are his house-fellows” (comp. Micah vii. 6; Matt. x. 35, 36; Luke xii. 53). *The whole passage however does not belong to the genuine text of the Mishna.* It is wanting, e.g. in the *Editio princeps*, Naples 1492. Being in the Jerusalem Talmud, it was certainly introduced thence into the Mishna.

²³ Comp. Schoettgen, *Horae Hebraicae*, ii. 533 sqq. Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr. on Matt.* xvii. 10. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 58–68. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 227–229. Alexandre, *Oracula Sibyllina* (1st ed.), ii. 513–516. S. K., *Der Prophet Elia in der Legende* (*Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1863, pp. 241–255, 281–296). “Elias who was to come” (*Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record*, new series, vol. x. 1867, pp. 371–376). Renan, *L'Antichrist*. Castelli, *Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei*, pp. 196–201. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen paläst. Theologie*, pp. 337–339.

²⁴ Commodian. *Carmen apologet.* v. 826 sq. *Orac. Sibyll.* ii. 187–190 (of Christian origin):—

Καὶ τότε ὁ Θεοσβίτης γε, ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἄρμα τιταίνων
Οὐράνιον, γαίῃ δ' ἐπιβάς, τότε σήματα τρισσά
Κόσμῳ ὅλῳ δείξει τε ἀπολλυμένου βίωτοιο.

²⁵ *Edujoth* viii. 7.

pronounce clean or unclean, to reject or admit families in general, but only to reject those who had entered by violence, and to admit those who had been rejected by violence. There was, beyond Jordan, a family of the name of Beth Zerefa, which a certain Ben Zion had excluded by violence. There was there another family (of impure blood), whom this Ben Zion had admitted by violence. Therefore he comes to pronounce such clean or unclean, to reject or to admit them. R. Jehudah says: only to admit, but not to reject. R. Simon says: his mission is merely to *arrange disputes*. The learned say neither to reject nor admit, but his coming is merely with the object of making peace in the world. For it is said: 'I send you, Elijah the prophet, to turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to the fathers' (Mal. iii. 4)." To the duty of the institutors of peace and order belongs also the decision of disputed cases. Therefore it is said in the Mishna, that money and property whose owners are disputed, or anything found whose owner is unknown, must wait "till Elijah comes."²⁶ The view that he will anoint the Messiah,²⁷ and raise the dead,²⁸ is also found in single instances. Besides Elijah, *the prophet like Moses*, who is promised Deut. xviii. 15 (John i. 21, vi. 14, vii. 40), was expected by many, while by others this passage was applied to the Messiah Himself. Allusions are also found in the New Testament to other prophets as forerunners of the Messiah, as *e.g.* Jeremiah (Matt. xvi. 14). In Christian authorities a

²⁶ *Baba mezia* iii. 4, 5, i. 8, ii. 8. Comp. also *Shekalim* ii. 5, *fin*.

²⁷ Justin. *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 8: Χριστός δὲ εἰ καὶ γεγένηται καὶ ἔστι που, ἀγνωστός ἐστι καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτός ποῦ ἑαυτὸν ἐπίσταται οὐδὲ ἔχει δύναμιν τινα, μέχρις ἂν ἔλθῶν Ἡλίας κρίσῃ αὐτὸν καὶ φανερὸν πᾶσι ποιήσῃ. Ibid. c. 49: Καὶ γὰρ πάντες ἡμεῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἀνθρώπου ἐξ ἀνθρώπων προσδοκῶμεν γενήσεσθαι καὶ τὸν Ἡλίου κρίσαι αὐτὸν ἐλθόντα. Comp. also John i. 31.

²⁸ *Sota* ix. 15 (quite at the end): "The resurrection of the dead comes through the prophet Elijah. The expectation is founded on the fact, that Elijah figures in the Old Testament as a raiser of the dead."

return of Enoch is also spoken of (Ev. Nicodemi, c. 25, and the patristic exegetes on Rev. xi. 3).²⁹

3. *The appearing of the Messiah.* After these preparations the Messiah will appear. For it is by no means the case, that pre-Christian Judaism did not expect the Messiah till *after* the judgment, and that it was under the influence of Christianity, that the notion of the Messiah Himself sitting in judgment upon His enemies was first found. For not only in Baruch and Ezra, not only in the figurative addresses of the Book of Enoch and in the Targums (where perhaps Christian influence might be admitted), but also in the oldest *Sibyll* (iii. 652–656), in the Psalter of Solomon (xvii. 24, 26, 27, 31, 38, 39, 41), and in Philo (*De præmiis et poenis*, § 16), and thus in decidedly pre-Christian documents, does Messiah appear for the overthrow of the ungodly powers. And the opposite view, that He will not appear till *after* the judgment, is found only in a solitary instance, viz. in the groundwork of the Book of Enoch (xc. 16–38). Hence His appearing must undoubtedly be spoken of in this place.

First with regard to his name as the appointed King of Israel and the anointed of God, he is most frequently called *the Anointed, the Messiah* (Enoch xlviii. 10, lii. 4; Apocal. Baruch xxix. 3, xxx. 1, xxxix. 7, xl. 1, lxx. 9, lxxii. 2; Ezra vii. 28, 29, where the Latin translation is interpolated; Ezra xii. 32: Unctus); Greek, *Χριστὸς κυρίου* (Psalt. Solom. xvii. 36, xviii. 6, 8); Hebr. מָשִׁיחַ (Mishna, *Berachoth* i. 5); Aramaic, מְשִׁיחָא (Mishna, *Sota* ix. 15); or מְלִכָא מְשִׁיחָא (both frequently in the Targums). The designation—the Son of man—which arose from appropriating directly to the Messiah, the image in Daniel of one coming in the clouds of heaven in the form of a man, but which, according to the context in Daniel, signifies the church and kingdom of God, is peculiar

²⁹ Comp. Philo, *Cod. Apocr. Nov. Test.* pp. 756–768, and the commentaries on John xi. 8

to the figurative addresses of the Book of Enoch (xlvi. 1-4, xlviii. 2, lxii. 7, 9, 14, lxiii. 11, lxix. 26, 27, lxx. 1). Inasmuch as the Messiah is the chosen instrument of God, and the love of God rests upon Him, He is called *the Elect* (Enoch xlv. 3, 4, xlix. 2, li. 3, 5, lii. 6, 9, liii. 6, lv. 4, lxi. 8, lxii. 1), or like the theocratic king in the Old Testament, the *Son of God* (Enoch cv. 2; 4 Ezra vii. 28, 29, xiii. 32, 37, 52, xiv. 9). In Enoch the title *Son of the Woman* once occurs, perhaps as a Christian interpolation, Enoch lxii. 5. It was universally acknowledged, on the ground of Old Testament prophecy,³⁰ that He would proceed from the *race of David* (Psalt. Solom. xvii. 5, 23; Matt. xxii. 42; Mark xii. 35; Luke xx. 41; John vii. 42; 4 Ezra xii. 32;³¹ Targum Jonathan on Isa. xi. 1; Jer. xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15). Hence, Son of David is a usual title of the Messiah (frequently in the New Testament *υἱὸς Δαυίδ*; in Targum Jonathan on Hosea iii. 5, בֶּר דָּוִד; in the Shemoneh Esreh, 15th Berachah, צִמְח דָּוִד). As Davidic He was also to be born in Bethlehem, the town of David (Micah v. 1 with the Targum; Matt. ii. 5; John vii. 41, 42).

Whether pre-Christian Judaism regarded the Messiah as simply human, or as a being of a higher order, and especially whether it attributed to him pre-existence, cannot, with the uncertainty about the dates of authorities, be positively decided.³² *The original Messianic hope did not expect an individual Messiah at all, but theocratic kings of the house of*

³⁰ Isa. xi. 1, 10; Jer. xxiii. 5, xxx. 9, xxxiii. 15, 17, 22; Ezek. xxxiv. 23 f., xxxvii. 24 f.; Hosea iii. 5; Amos ix. 11; Micah v. 1; Zech. xii. 8.

³¹ The words, *qui orietur ex semine David*, are indeed wanting in the Latin translation, but are to be regarded as original according to the unanimous testimony of the Oriental versions.

³² For later Judaism, comp. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 86-147. De Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik*, pp. 169-171. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 292-300. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* ix. 437 sq. (2nd ed. ix. 666 sq.). Castelli, *Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei*, pp. 202-215.

*David.*³³ Subsequently the hope was consolidated and raised more and more into the expectation of a *personal Messiah* as a ruler endowed by God with special gifts and powers. In the time of Christ this form had at all events long been the prevailing one. But this naturally implies that the picture would more and more acquire superhuman features. The more exceptional the position awarded to the Messiah, the more does He Himself step forth from ordinary human limits. In the freedom with which the religious circle of ideas moved, this was effected in a very different fashion. In general however *the Messiah was thought of as a human king and ruler, but as one endowed by God with special gifts and powers.* This is especially evident in the Solomonian Psalter. He here appears as altogether a human king (xvii. 23, 47), but a righteous one (xvii. 35), free from sin and holy (xvii. 41, 46), endowed by the Holy Ghost with power, wisdom and righteousness (xvii. 42). It is the same view, only briefly expressed, which designates him as *ἀγνὸς ἀναξ* (*Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 49). Elsewhere, on the other hand, even pre-existence is ascribed to him, and his whole appearing raised more to the superhuman. So especially in the figurative addresses in the Book of Enoch.³⁴ It must not indeed be reckoned in this respect, that he is, as already mentioned, called the Son of God. For the official predicate tells us nothing at all of His nature; nor does His designation in Enoch as the Son of man of itself tell us anything. The whole view of His person is however in both the above-named works one essentially super-

Weber, *System der altsynagogalen paläst. Theologie*, p. 339 ff. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, art. "Messias," pp. 738-765.

³³ The promise of a king of David's house "for ever" means, in the first place, only that the *dynasty* should not die out. Thus *e.g.* the Maccabean Simon was chosen by the people as ruler and high priest "for ever" (*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, 1 Macc. xiv. 41), *i.e.* the government and high-priesthood were declared hereditary in his family.

³⁴ Comp. Hellwag, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1848, pp. 151-160.

natural. In the figurative addresses in the Book of Enoch, it is said of Him: He was (before his manifestation on earth) hidden and kept with God (xlvi. 1, 2, lxii. 7). His name was named before the Lord of spirits, before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars were made (xlvi. 3).³⁵ He was chosen and was hidden with God *before the world was created*, and will be with Him to eternity (xlvi. 6). His countenance is as the appearance of a man, and full of grace, *like one of the holy angels* (xlvi. 1). It is he, who has righteousness, with whom righteousness dwells, and who reveals all the treasures of that which is concealed, because the Lord of spirits has chosen him, and his lot before the Lord of spirits has surpassed everything through uprightness for ever (xlvi. 3). His glory is from eternity to eternity, and his power from generation to generation. In him dwells the spirit of wisdom, and the spirit of Him who gives knowledge, and the spirit of instruction and strength, and the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness. And he will judge the hidden things, and no one will be able to hold vain discourse before him, for he is chosen before the Lord of spirits according to his good pleasure (xlix. 2-4). In essential agreement with this are the expressions of the *fourth Book of Ezra*. Compare especially xii. 32: *Hic est Unctus, quem reservavit Altissimus in finem*; and xiii. 24: *Ipse est, quem conservat Altissimus multis temporibus*. As his pre-existence is here expressly taught, so is it presupposed when it is promised to Ezra, that after his admission into heaven he will return with the Messiah (*tu enim recipieris ab hominibus, et converteris residuum cum filio meo et cum similibus tuis, usquequo finiantur tempora*). And quite in accordance with Enoch is his pre-existence designated as a state of concealment with God (xiii. 52): *Sicut non potest hoc vel scrutinare vel scire quis, quid sit in*

³⁵ Comp. Targum Jonathan on Zech. iv. 7: The Messiah *whose name was named before eternity*.

profundo maris, sic non poterit quisque super terram videre filium meum, vel eos qui cum eo sunt, nisi in tempore diei. It has been in many respects attempted, but hardly with justice, to refer this entire series of thought to Christian influences. It is indeed perfectly comprehensible from Old Testament premises. Such expressions as Micah v. 2, that the origins of Messiah are from of old, from the days of eternity (מִקְדָּם מִיָּמֵי עוֹלָם), might easily be understood in the sense of a pre-existence from eternity. Besides, the passage Dan. vii. 13–14 need only be understood of the person of the Messiah and taken literally, and the doctrine of the pre-existence is already stated. For it is self-evident, that he who comes down from heaven, was before in heaven. This view was favoured by the fact that the whole course of the development tended towards the notion, that everything truly valuable previously existed in heaven.³⁶ On the other hand, many traces show that post-Christian Judaism, far from elevating the person of the Messiah, under Christian influence to the supernatural, strongly emphasized the human side in opposition to Christianity. We need only recall the saying in Justin's *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, c. 49: πάντες ἡμεῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἀνθρώπου ἐξ ἀνθρώπων προσδοκῶμεν γενήσεσθαι. And akin with this is a Talmudic passage *Jer. Taanith* ii. 1 (given by Oehler, ix. 437, 2nd ed. 667): “R. Abbahu said: If a man says to thee—I am God, he lies; I am the Son of man, he will at last repent it; I ascend to heaven, if he said it he will not prove it.” Thus it was just the humanity upon which post-Christian Judaism strongly insisted. And so much the less cause have we to refer the view of the pre-existence to Christian influence.

Concerning the *time* of Messiah's appearing the later Rabbis

³⁶ See above, p. 134, and Harnack on *Hermas*, *Vis.* ii. 4. 1 (according to *Hermas* the Christian Church was pre-existent). In the Old Testament a heavenly model of the tabernacle and its vessels is already assumed (*Ex.* xxv. 9, 40, xxvi. 30, xxvii. 8; *Num.* viii. 4).

made all manner of ingenious computations.³⁷ The view *that the present world would last six thousand years*, corresponding to the six days of creation, because one day is with God as a thousand years, seems to have been pretty widely disseminated.³⁸ But the date of the advent of Messiah seems under this presupposition to have been very variously computed, according as his days were identified with the future עולם or still reckoned in the present עולם (comp. below, No. 9). According to the former and older view, the Messianic period would begin after the lapse of the sixth thousand (so Barnabas, Irenaeus and others). On the latter supposition (that the days of the Messiah belonged to the present עולם), the present course of the world was divided into three periods: 2000 years without law, 2000 years under the law, and 2000 years of the Messianic period. According to this computation the time appointed for the Messiah's advent had already arrived, but he could not yet appear because of the transgressions of the people.³⁹ This latter was, at least in rigidly legal circles, the general view: *the Messiah cannot come until the people repent and perfectly fulfil the law*. "If all Israel would together repent for a whole day, the redemption by Messiah would ensue." If Israel would only keep two Sabbaths properly, we should be immediately redeemed.⁴⁰

The manner of Messiah's advent is represented as sudden all at once he is there and appears as a victorious ruler. As on the other hand it is assumed, that he is born as a child in Bethlehem, the two views are combined by the admission, that he will at first live in concealment and then *suddenly come*

³⁷ *Sanhedrin* 96^b–97^a, fully given in Delitzsch's *Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer*, pp. 762–764, and in Castelli, *Il Messia*, p. 297 sqq. Comp. Weber, *System*, p. 334 sq.

³⁸ *Barnabas*, c. 15; Irenaeus, v. 28. 3, and Hilgenfeld's and Harnack's notes to *Barnabas*, c. 15.

³⁹ See Delitzsch and Weber as above (*Sanhedrin* 97^a; *Aboda sara* 9^a).

⁴⁰ See Weber, *System*, p. 333 sq.

forth from concealment.⁴¹ Therefore the Jews say in John vii. 27: ὁ Χριστὸς ὅταν ἔρχηται, οὐδεὶς γινώσκει πόθεν ἐστίν. And in Justin's *Dialogus cum Tryphone* it is just on this account that the possibility, that Messiah may have already been born, is left open to the representative of the Jewish view.⁴² It is related in the Jerusalem Talmud, that the Messiah was born on the day the temple was destroyed, but some time after carried away from his mother by a tempest.⁴³ In the Targum on Micah iv. 8 also, it is assumed that he is already present, but *still concealed*, and that *because of the sins of the people*. In later writers is found the view that he would proceed from Rome.⁴⁴ The belief that he would at his advent authenticate himself by *miracles* was universal (Matt. xi. 4 sqq.; Luke vii. 22 sqq.; John vii. 31).

4. *Last attack of the hostile powers.*⁴⁵ After the appearing of the Messiah, the heathen powers will assemble against him for a last attack. This expectation too was suggested by Old Testament passages, especially by Dan. xi. It is very plainly expressed *Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 663 sqq. and 4 Ezra xiii. 33 sqq., also in Enoch xc. 16, only that here it is not an attack against Messiah, but against the people of God. It is frequently held, that this last attack takes place under the

⁴¹ Comp. Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae* on John vii. 27. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 223–225. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* ix. 438 (2nd ed. ix. 668). Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 293 sq. Weber, *System*, p. 342 sqq.

⁴² *Dial. c. Tryph. c. 8*: Χριστὸς δὲ εἰ καὶ γεγέννηται καὶ ἐστὶ πον, ἀγνωστός ἐστι καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς πω ἑαυτὸν ἐπίσταται οὐδὲ ἔχει δυνάμιν τινα. *Ibid. c. 110*: εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐληλυθέναι λέγουσιν, οὐ γινώσκεται ὅς ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ὅταν ἐμφανῆς καὶ Ἰνδοξος γένηται, τότε γνωσθήσεται ὅς ἐστι, Φασί.

⁴³ See the whole passage in Lightfoot's *Horae* on Matt. ii. 1. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 279 sq.

⁴⁴ Targum *Jerushalmi* on Ex. xiii. 42 and *Bab. Sanhedrin* 98^a. The latter passage is given in Delitzsch's *Commentar zum Hebräerbrief*, p. 117, and in Wünsche, *Die Leiden des Messias* (1870), p. 57 sq.

⁴⁵ See Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, pp. 296–308. For the O. T. Herm. Schultz, *Alttestamentliche Theologie* (2nd ed. 1878), p. 696.

leadership of a chief adversary of the Messiah, of an "Antichrist" (the name is in the N. T. in the Johannean Epistles, 1 John ii. 18, 22, iv. 3; 2 John 7; the thing in Apoc. Baruch c. 40; 2 Thess. ii.; Rev. xiii.).⁴⁶ In later Rabbinic authorities the enigmatical name Armilus (אַרְמִילוּס) occurs for this chief adversary of the people of Israel.⁴⁷ The reappearance of Gog and Magog is also expected on the ground of Ezek. xxxviii.—xxxix., but as a rule not till after the close of the Messianic kingdom, as a last manifestation of the ungodly powers (Rev. xx. 8, 9).⁴⁸

5. *Destruction of the hostile powers.*⁴⁹ The destruction of the hostile powers takes place according to Old Testament prediction by means of a great judgment, inflicted by God Himself upon His adversaries.⁵⁰ This view is most faithfully adhered to in the *Assumptio Mosis*, the tenth chapter of which in many respects recalls Joel chaps. iii. and iv. Closely akin to it is the statement in the groundwork of the Book of Enoch, inasmuch as here too God Himself destroys the power of the heathen nations (xc. 18, 19) and then sits in judgment, at which judgment however only the fallen and disobedient angels and the apostate Israelites (the blinded sheep) are

⁴⁶ Comp. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 69–74. Gesenius, art. "Antichrist," in Ersch and Gruber's *Enc.* sec. i. vol. iv. (1820) p. 292 sq. Hausrath in Schenkel's *Bibellez.* i. 137 sq. Kähler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. i. 446 sqq. For the history of the Christian doctrine, the chief work is Malvenda, *De Antichristo*, Romae 1604.

⁴⁷ Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 221–224, s.v. אַרְמִילוּס. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum* (1700), ii. 704–715. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 72 sq. (art. "Armilus"). Castelli, *Il Messia*, p. 239 sqq. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 282, also pp. 130, 140.

⁴⁸ Comp. *Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 319 sqq., 512 sqq. Mishna, *Edujoth* ii. 10. The commentaries on Rev. xx. 8, 9. The articles on Gog and Magog in the Bible Dictionaries (Schenkel, Winer, Riehm) and in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. v. 263–265. Uhlemann on Gog and Magog (*Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1862, pp. 265–286). Renan, *L'Antichrist*. Weber, *System*, p. 396 sqq.

⁴⁹ Comp. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 232–234.

⁵⁰ See in general, Knobel, *Der Prophetismus der Hebräer*, i. 325 sq.

condemned (xc. 20–27), while the heathen nations submit to the people of God (xc. 30). The Messiah, who is altogether absent in the *Assumptio Mosis*, here first appears *after* the judgment (xc. 37). It is common to both, that it is God Himself who sits in judgment. The ordinary notion however was, that the Messiah would destroy the hostile powers. Already in the oldest Sibyllist (iii. 652 sqq.) he appears “to put an end to all war upon earth, killing some and fulfilling the promises given to others.” In Philo (*De praem. et poen.* § 16) it is said of him, that he “takes the field and makes war and will subdue great and populous nations.” Still more clearly does he appear in the *Psalterium Salomonis* as the conqueror of the heathen adversaries of God’s people, and it is here specially noteworthy, that he overthrows his enemies by the mere word of his mouth (ἐν λόγῳ στόματος αὐτοῦ, according to Isa. xi. 4). In entire agreement with these older types is the destruction of the heathen world-powers represented in the Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Esdras as the first act of the Messiah, when he appears (Apoc. Baruch xxxix. 7–xl. 2, lxx. 9, lxxii. 2–6; 4 Ezra xii. 32, 33, xiii. 27, 28, xxxv.–xxxviii.). The only difference is, that, according to the fourth Book of Ezra, this destruction results from a sentence of God’s anointed (xiii. 28: *non tenebat frameam neque vas bellicosum*; xiii. 28: *perdet eos sine labore per legem*), while in the Apocalypse of Baruch although forensic forms are spoken of, yet weapons of war are also mentioned (the former xl. 1, 2, the latter lxxii. 6). Still more decidedly than in the fourth Book of Ezra, is the judgment of the Messiah upon an ungodly world described as purely forensic in the figurative addresses in the Book of Enoch. One might indeed feel tempted to ascribe to this book also the view of a war of extermination, since it is said of the Son of man, chap. xlvi. 4–6, that he stirs up the kings and the mighty ones from their beds, loosens the bridles of the powerful and

breaks the teeth of sinners; that he thrusts kings from their thrones and out of their kingdoms, and (lii. 4–9) that nothing on earth is able to resist his power. “There will be no iron for war, nor coat of mail; brass will be of no avail, and tin will be of no avail and will be of no esteem, and lead will not be desired.” But in other places it is repeatedly said, that the elect, the Son of man, will sit upon the throne of His glory to judge men and angels (xlv. 3, lv. 4, lxix. 27, lxi. 8, 9). In the chief passage also, chap. lxii., the judgment is described in purely forensic forms. The Lord of spirits sits upon the throne of his glory (lxii. 2), and the Son of the woman, the Son of man, sits upon the throne of his glory (lxii. 5 sqq.). And the kings and mighty ones of the earth are struck when they see him with fear and terror, and extol and praise and supplicate him, and entreat mercy from him (lxii. 4–9). But the Lord of spirits will reject them, so that they will speedily flee before his face, and their faces be filled with shame. And the avenging angels will receive them, to exercise retribution upon them, for having ill-treated his children and his elect (lxii. 10, 11). Finally, we again find in the Targums the view, that the Messiah overcomes his enemies in battle, as a mighty hero. So in Jonathan on Isa. x. 27: “The nations are crushed by the Messiah;” and especially in Pseudo-Jonathan and Jerushalmi on Gen. xlix. 11: “How beautiful is King Messiah, who will proceed from the house of Judah. He girds his loins and enters the field and sets the battle in array against his foes and kills kings.” We just see from all this, that the general idea of a destruction of the anti-godly powers by the Messiah is fashioned very variously as to its particulars.⁶¹ Not till after the destruction

⁶¹ In a passage of the Babylonian Talmud (*Sukka* 52^a) and frequently afterwards, the destruction of the hostile powers is represented not as the task of the Messiah proper, but as that of a subordinate Messiah, of “Messiah the son of Joseph” (משיח בן יוסף). He is also called “Messiah the son of Ephraim,” and is therefore the Messiah of the ten tribes, and

of the ungodly can the Messianic age appear. For "as long as there are sinners in the world, so long does the wrath of God endure, but as they disappear from the world the divine wrath also vanishes."⁵²

6. *Renovation of Jerusalem.*⁵³ Since the Messianic kingdom is to be set up in the Holy Land (comp. e.g. 4 Ezra ix. 9), Jerusalem itself must first of all be renovated. This was however expected in diverse manners. In the simplest it was regarded only as a purification of the holy city, especially "from the heathen, who now tread it under foot" (*Psalt. Salom.* xvii. 25, 33). After the destruction of Jerusalem it took the form of a rebuilding and indeed of a rebuilding "to an eternal building" (*Shemoneh Esreh*, 14th Berachah). With this is however found the view, that already in the pre-Messianic time a far more glorious Jerusalem than the earthly exists with God in heaven, and that this will, at the commencement of the Messianic age, descend to earth. The Old Testament foundation for this hope is especially Ezek. xl.-xlviii., also Isa. liv. 11 sqq., lx.; Hag. ii. 7-9; Zech. ii. 6-17; the new Jerusalem described in these passages being conceived of as now already existing in heaven. This *ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ* (Gal. iv. 26), *Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐπουράνιος* (Heb. xii. 22) *καὶ νῦν Ἱερουσαλήμ* (Rev. iii. 12,

has only the comparatively subordinate task of fighting against the ungodly powers, in which fight he will fall, while the Messiah, the son of David, will set up the kingdom of glory. Compare on this very recent view, Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 75-81. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 258 sqq. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* ix. 440 (2nd ed. ix. 669 sq.). Wünsche, *Die Leiden des Messias*, pp. 109-121. Castelli, *Il Messia*, pp. 224-236, 342 sqq. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 356 sqq. Weber, *System*, p. 346 sq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 767-770 (art. "Messias Sohn Joseph").

⁵² Mishna, *Sanhedrin* x. 6, *fin.*

⁵³ Comp. Schoettgen, *De Hierosolyma coelesti* (*Horae Hebraicae*, i. 1205-1248). Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, p. 199 sq. Wetzstein, *Nov. Test.* on Gal. iv. 26. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, ii. 839 sqq. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 217-221. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 245 sqq., 308. Weber, *System*, p. 356 sqq.

xxi. 2, 10) is also, as is well known, often spoken of in the New Testament; comp. also *Test. Dan.* c. v.: ἡ νέα Ἱερουσαλήμ. According to the Apocalypse of Baruch, this heavenly Jerusalem was originally in Paradise before Adam sinned. But when he transgressed the command of God, it was taken from him, as was also Paradise, and preserved in heaven. It was afterwards shown in a vision of the night to Abraham, and also to Moses upon Mount Sinai (Apoc. Baruch iv. 2-6). Ezra too saw it in a vision (4 Ezra x. 44-59). This new and glorious Jerusalem is then to appear on earth in the place of the old one, which it will far surpass in pomp and beauty, Enoch liii. 6, xc. 28, 29; 4 Ezra vii. 26. Comp. also Apoc. Baruch xxxii. 4.

7. *Gathering of the Dispersed.*⁵⁴ That the dispersed of Israel would share in the Messianic kingdom, and for this purpose return to Palestine, was so self-evident, that this hope would have been cherished even without the definite predictions of the Old Testament. The *Psalterium Salomonis* (Ps. xi.) poetically describes how the dispersed of Israel will assemble from the west and east, from the north and from the Isles, and come to Jerusalem. The Greek Book of Baruch expresses a partly verbal agreement with the *Psalt. Sal.* (iv. 36, 37, v. 5-9). Philo sees the dispersed under the leadership of a divine appearance coming from all quarters to Jerusalem (*De exsecrationibus*, § 8-9). The prediction too of Isaiah, that the heathen nations shall themselves bring the dispersed as an offering to the temple (Isa. xlix. 22, lx. 4, 9, lxvi. 20) reappears in the *Psalt. Salom.* (xvii. 34), while the gathering is at the same time described as the work of the Messiah (*Psalt. Salom.* xvii. 28. Jonathan on Jerem. xxxiii. 13). According to the fourth Book of Ezra, the ten tribes departed

⁵⁴ Comp. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 235-238. The sequence is: (1) the renovation of Jerusalem; (2) the gathering of the Dispersed, according to the *Sohar* in Gfrörer, ii. 217, above.

into a hitherto uninhabited country called Azareth (so the Latin version) or Arzaph (*fons mundi*, so the Syrian), that they might there observe their laws.⁵⁵ Thence will they return at the commencement of the Messianic period, and the Most High will dry up the sources of the Euphrates, that they may pass over (4 Ezra xiii. 39-47). With this universal hope of the gathering of the dispersed, it is striking, that the return of the ten tribes is altogether doubted by individuals like R. Akiba.⁵⁶ From the daily prayer however of the Shemoneh Esreh: "Lift up a banner to gather our dispersed and assemble us from the four ends of the earth," it is seen that such doubts were confined to individuals.

8. *The kingdom of glory in Palestine.* The Messianic kingdom will indeed have the Messianic King at its head, but its supreme ruler is God Himself (comp. e.g. *Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 704-706, 717, 756-759; *Psalt. Salom.* xvii. 1, 38, 51; *Shemoneh Esreh*, 11th Berachah. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 1). *With the setting up of this kingdom, the idea of God's kingship over Israel becomes full reality and truth.* God is indeed already the King of Israel. He does not however exercise His kingship to its full extent, but on the contrary temporarily exposes His people to the heathen world-powers, to chastise them for their sins. In the glorious future kingdom He again takes the government into His own hand. Hence

⁵⁵ Azareth=אֶרֶץ אַחֲרַת, *terra alia* (4 Ezra xiii. 40); the Hebrew expression in Deut. xxix. 27, which passage is in the Mishna referred to the ten tribes (see the next note). This undoubtedly correct explanation was first given by Schiller-Szinessy (*Journal of Philology*, vol. iii. 1870), and afterwards by Bensly, *The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation of the Fourth Book of Ezra* (1875), p. 23, note.

⁵⁶ *Sanhedrin* x. 3, *fin.*: "The ten tribes never more return, for it is said of them (Deut. xxix. 27): He will cast them into another land as this day. Hence as this day passes away and does not return, so shall they pass away and not return. So R. Akiba. But R. Elieser says: As the day grows darker and then light again, so will it some day be light again with the ten tribes, with whom it is now dark."

it is called in contrast to the heathen kingdoms, *the kingdom of God* (βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, in the New Testament, especially in Mark and Luke. *Sibyll.* iii. 47, 48: βασιλεία μεγίστη ἀθανάτου βασιλῆος. Comp. *Psalt. Salom.* xvii. 4; *Assumptio Mosis* x. 1, 3). Of similar meaning is the expression occurring in Matthew, βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, "kingdom of heaven."⁵⁷ For "heaven" here is, according to a very current Jewish expression, a metonymy for God. It is the kingdom, which is governed not by earthly powers, but by heaven.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ Comp. on this expression, Schoettgen, *De regno coelorum* (*Horae Hebraicae*, i. 1147–1152). Lightfoot, *Horae* on Matt. iii. 2. Wetzstein, *Nov. Test.* on Matt. iii. 2. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 187–192. De Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik*, pp. 175–177. Tholuck, *Bergpredigt*, p. 66 sq. Fritzsche, *Evangelium Matthaei*, p. 109 sqq. (where still more literature is given). Kuinoel on Matt. iii. 2. The Commentaries in general on Matt. iii. 2. Wichelhaus, *Commentar zu der Leidensgeschichte* (1855), p. 284 sqq. Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, ii. 33 sqq. Schürer, *Der Begriff des Himmelreiches aus jüdischen Quellen erläutert* (*Jahrb. für prot. Theol.* 1876, pp. 166–187). Cremer, *Bibl.-theol. Wörterb. s.v. βασιλεία*. Also *Theol. Litzg.* 1883, p. 581.

⁵⁸ I have shown in the article quoted (*Jahrb. für prot. Theol.* 1876, p. 166 sqq.) how current this metonymy was in Judaism in the time of Christ. The formula מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם in particular frequently occurs, certainly not as a rule with the meaning of "kingdom of heaven," but as *abstractum* "the kingship, the government of heaven," i.e. the rule of God (e.g. *Mishna, Berachoth* ii. 2, 5). But just here there can be no doubt that שָׁמַיִם stands metonymically for "God." So much the stranger is it, to dispute the correctness of this meaning, where βασιλεία stands as *concretum* (with the signification "kingdom"); for the genitive τῶν οὐρανῶν remains the same, whether βασιλεία means "the kingship," or "the kingdom." If accidentally the expression מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם, not meaning "the kingdom of heaven," should occur in Rabbinic literature, this would be sufficiently explained by the fact that the Rabbis seldom speak of the "kingdom of God" at all. They say instead "the days of Messiah" or "the עוֹלָם to come," or the like. It seems however, that the expression does nevertheless occur with the meaning in question, so especially *Pesikta* (ed. Buber) p. 51^a: הַגִּיעַ זְמַנָּה שֶׁל מַלְכוּת הַרְשָׁעָה שֶׁתַּעֲקֹר מִן הָעוֹלָם, הַגִּיעַ זְמַנָּה שֶׁל מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם, "The time of the ungodly *Malkuth* is come, that it should be rooted out of the world; the time of the *Malkuth* of heaven is come, that it should be revealed." The same passage also in *Midrash rabba* on the Song of Solomon (in Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb. s.v. מַלְכוּת*). Comp. also Weber, *System*, p. 349. Cremer, *Biblisch-theol. Wörterb. s.v. βασιλεία* (3rd ed. p. 162).

The Holy Land forms the *central point* of this kingdom. Hence "to inherit the land" is equivalent to having part in the Messianic kingdom.⁵⁹ But it is not confined to the limits of Palestine; on the contrary, it is as a rule conceived of as in some way or other comprising the whole world.⁶⁰ Already, in the Old Testament, it was predicted that the Gentiles too should acknowledge the God of Israel as the supreme Judge (Isa. ii. 2 sqq.; Micah iv. 1 sqq., vii. 16 sq.), be converted to Him (Isa. xlii. 1–6, xlix. 6, li. 4, 5; Jer. iii. 17, xvi. 19 sq.; Zeph. ii. 11, iii. 9; Zech. viii. 20 sqq.), and be consequently admitted into the theocracy (Isa. lv. 5, lvi. 1 sqq.; Jer. xii. 14; Zech. ii. 15), so that Jahveh is King over the whole earth (Zech. xiv. 9) and the Messiah a banner for all nations (Isa. xi. 10). Most decidedly is power over all the kingdoms of the world promised in the Book of Daniel to the saints of the Most High (Dan. ii. 14, vii. 14, 27). This hope was also stedfastly adhered to by later Judaism, though in a different manner. According to the Sibyllines the heathen, when they see the quiet and peace of God's people, will of themselves come to reason, and praise and celebrate the only true God, send gifts to His temple and walk after His laws (*Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 698–726). Then will God set up a kingdom over all men, in which the prophets of God are judges and righteous kings (iii. 766–783). According to Philo the pious and virtuous receive the rule over the world, because they possess the three qualities, which especially make men competent to be rulers, viz. *σεμνότης*, *δευότης* and *εὐεργεσία*. And other men submit to them through *αἰδώς* or *φόβος* or *εὐνοία* (*De praeem. et poen.* § 16). Elsewhere the rule of the saints appears more as one founded on power. The heathen do homage to the Messiah, because they perceive

⁵⁹ *Kiddushin* i. 10. Comp. Matt. v. 5 (ed. Tischendorf, v. 4).

⁶⁰ See Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 219 sq., 238–242. Weber, *System*, p. 364 sqq.

that God has given him power (Enoch xc. 30, 37. *Figurative addresses*, xlvi. 5, liii. 1; *Psalt. Salom.* xvii. 32-35; *Sibyll.* iii. 49: ἀγνὸς ἀναξ πάσης γῆς σκῆπτρα κρατήσων. Apoc. Baruch lxxii. 5. Targum on Zech. iv. 7: The Messiah will rule over all kingdoms). This notion comes forward in the most one-sided form in the *Assumptio Mosis*, whose author desires nothing more ardently, than that Israel should tread upon the neck of the eagle (x. 8: tunc felix eris tu Istrahel, et ascendes supra cervices et alas aquilae). According to the *Book of Jubilees* (Ewald's *Jahrb.* vol. iii. p. 42) it was already promised to Jacob, that kings should go forth from him, who should rule, wherever the children of men had trodden. "And I will give unto thy seed the whole earth, which is under heaven, and they shall rule at their pleasure over all nations, and afterwards they shall draw to themselves the whole earth and inherit it for ever" (comp. also Rom. iv. 13, and its expositors, especially Wetzstein).

The Messianic period is moreover described, and that mostly on the ground of Old Testament passages, as one of joy and gladness.⁶¹ All war, strife, discord and quarrels shall cease, and peace, righteousness, love and faithfulness prevail upon earth (*Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 371-380, 751-760. Philo, *De praem. et poen.* § 16; Apoc. Baruch lxxiii. 4, 5). The wild beasts also will lose their enmity to man and serve him (*Sibyll.* iii. 620-623, 743-750; Apoc. Baruch xxix. 5-8). Wealth and prosperity will prevail among men (Philo, *De praem. et poen.* § 17-18). The age of man will increase to near upon a thousand years, and yet men will neither be old nor weary of life, but like children and youths ("Jubilees" in Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 24). All will rejoice in bodily health and strength. Women will bring forth without pain, and the reaper will not

⁶¹ Comp. Knobel, *Prophetismus der Hebräer*, i. 321 sqq. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 242-252. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* p. 770 sqq. (art. "Messiaszeit").

weary at his work (Philo, *De praem. et poen.* § 20. Apoc. Baruch lxxiii. 2, 3, 7, lxxiv. 1).⁶²

These external blessings are not however the only ones. On the contrary, they result from the fact, that the Messianic Church is a holy nation, which God has sanctified, and which the Messiah governs in righteousness. He suffers no unrighteousness to remain in its midst, and there is not a man in it who knows wickedness. There is no unrighteousness among His people, for they are all holy (*Psalt. Salom.* xvii. 28, 29, 36, 48, 49, xviii. 9, 10). Life in the Messianic kingdom is a continual λατρεύειν θεῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (Luke i. 74, 75). And the rule of Messiah over the heathen world is by no means conceived of as resting only on power, but frequently in such wise, that he is a light to the Gentiles (Isa. xlii. 6, xlix. 6, li. 4; Enoch xlvi. 4; Luke ii. 32. Comp. especially the already mentioned passages of the Sibyllines, iii. 710–726). An Israelite being unable to conceive of a λατρεύειν θεῷ otherwise than in the form of the *temple worship and the observance of the law*, it is in truth self-evident, that these are not to cease in the Messianic kingdom. In fact this is at least the prevailing view.⁶³ Hence after the destruction of the temple the daily prayer of the Israelite is for the restoration of the sacrificial ritual (עֲבוֹדָה).⁶⁴

In this glorious future kingdom not only the dispersed

⁶² Sometimes this future glory is also represented under the figure of a feast (סעודה), which God prepares for the righteous. See Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, ii. 872–889. Corrodi, *Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus*, i. 329 sqq. Bertholdt, *De Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 196–199. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* p. 1312 sqq. (art. "Zukunftsmahl"). Comp. Matt. viii. 11; Luke xiii. 29.

⁶³ For farther particulars, see Weber, *System*, p. 359 sqq. Castelli, *Il Messia*, p. 277 sqq.

⁶⁴ *Shemoneh Esreh*, 17th Berachah (see above, p. 87). Comp. also the Passover liturgy, *Pesachim* i. 6.

members of the nation, but also all *deceased Israelites* are to participate. They will come forth from their graves to enjoy, with those of their fellow-countrymen who are then living, the happiness of Messiah's kingdom.⁶⁵

The eschatological expectations of many terminate with this hope of a kingdom of glory in Palestine, seeing its duration is conceived of as everlasting. As Old Testament prophecy had promised to the people of Israel that they should dwell in the land for ever (Jer. xxiv. 6; Ezek. xxxvii. 25; Joel iv. 20), that David's throne should never be vacant (Jer. xxxiii. 17, 22), and David should always be the king of Israel (Ezek. xxxvii. 25), and as, especially in the Book of Daniel, the kingdom of the saints of the Most High is designated an everlasting one (מְלָכוּת עֶלְיָם, Dan. vii. 27), so also is eternal duration frequently ascribed to the Messianic kingdom by later writers (*Sibyll.* iii. 766; *Psalt. Salom.* xvii. 4; *Sibyll.* iii. 49-50; Enoch lxii. 14). Hence too the Jews say in John xii. 34: *Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, showing that this view was also current in later Jewish theology.⁶⁶ Subsequently however the glory of the Messianic kingdom was regarded as not ultimate and

⁶⁵ Stähelin (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1874, p. 199 sqq.) does not seem to me right in keeping the *Messianic hope* and the *hope of a resurrection* as far apart as possible, nay in supposing that there was originally no connection between them. In Dan. xii. 2 and *Psalt. Salom.* iii. 16 this connection is unmistakeable. For if in both passages it is said that the just shall rise "to eternal life," this life can, according to the sphere of thought in both books, mean only life in the Messianic kingdom. The two books know nothing of any other *ζωή*. Comp. also Enoch li. 1-5. The course of development too seems to me just the reverse of that, which Stähelin lays down. The hope of a resurrection and the Messianic hope were not originally independent of, and subsequently combined with, each other. But, on the contrary, from the hope of sharing in the Messianic kingdom, first arose the hope of a bodily resurrection, and afterwards life during Messiah's reign and *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* were separated the one from the other.

⁶⁶ Comp. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, p. 155 sq.

supreme, but a still higher and heavenly happiness was expected after it, and hence a *duration bounded by time*,⁶⁷ the measure of which is fully discussed in the Talmud,⁶⁸ was ascribed to the reign of the Messiah. The Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Ezra, among the more ancient monuments, hold this view the most decidedly. It is indeed said of the Messiah in the former, c. lxxiii. 1, that He sits *in aeternum* super throno regni sui. But what is meant by this is seen from another passage, c. xl. 3: Et erit principatus ejus stans *in saeculum, donec finiatur mundus corruptionis*. Hence the rule of Messiah lasts only as long as this transitory world. Similarly it is said in the fourth Book of Ezra (xii. 34), that He will redeem and revive the people of God *quoadusque veniat finis, dies judicii*. Still farther detail is given in the chief passage, vii. 28, 29: Jocundabuntur, qui relictis sunt, *annis quadragentis*. Et erit post annos hos, et morietur filius meus Christus et omnes qui spiramentum habent homines.⁶⁹ The duration of Messiah's kingdom is by others, and also in the above-named passage of the Talmud (*Sanhedrin* 99^a), computed at 400 years. From it we also learn that this computation rests upon Gen. xv. 13 (the bondage in Egypt lasted 400 years) compared with Ps. xc. 15: "Make us glad according to the days wherein Thou hast afflicted us and the years wherein we have seen evil." Thus the time of happiness is to last as long as the time of affliction. A different calculation is presupposed in the Revelation, the duration being stated at 1000 years, according to the saying in the Psalm, that one day is with God as a thousand years (Rev. xx. 4-6). This computation also is mentioned in the

⁶⁷ Comp. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 252-256. Renan, *L'Antichrist*. Weber, *System*, p. 355 sq. Drummond, pp. 312-318.

⁶⁸ *Sanhedrin* 99^a, in Gfrörer, ii. 252 sqq. More fully (*Sanhedrin* 96^b-99^a) in Castelli, p. 297 sqq.

⁶⁹ The Latin and Arabic translations have the number 400, the Syrian 30. In the Ethiopic and Armenian the number is altogether wanting.

Talmud.⁷⁰ We see then, that wherever only a temporal duration is ascribed to the kingdom of the Messiah, a renovation of the world and the last judgment are expected at the end of this period.

9. *Renovation of the world.*⁷¹ The hope of a renovation of heaven and earth is chiefly based on Isa. lxv. 17, lxvi. 22 (comp. also Matt. xix. 28; Rev. xxi. 1; 2 Pet. iii. 13). Accordingly a distinction is made between a *present* and a *future* world, הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה and הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא,⁷² in the New Testament frequently: ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος and ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων or ὁ ἐρχόμενος (e.g. Matt. xii. 32; Mark x. 30; Luke xviii. 30). But a difference of view arose, inasmuch as some made the new world appear with the beginning of Messiah's reign, while others placed it after its conclusion. The former is found e.g. in the figurative discourses of the Book of Enoch (c. xlv. 4, 5), "And at that day I will let my elect dwell among you and will change the heaven and make it an eternal blessing and light. And I will transform the earth and make it a blessing, and cause my elect to dwell in it" (comp. also xci. 16). The

⁷⁰ *Sanhedrin* 97^a. Comp. Gfrörer, ii. 254. Castelli, p. 300. Drummond, p. 317. Delitzsch, *Commentar zum Hebräerbrief*, p. 763.

⁷¹ Comp. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, p. 213 sq. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 272–275. The Rabbinic *terminus technicus* therefore is הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, Buxtorf, *Lex.* col. 711. Comp. Matt. xix. 28: παλιγγενεσία.

⁷² *Mishna*, *Berachoth* i. 5; *Peah* i. 1; *Kiddushin* iv. 14; *Baba mezia* ii. 11, *Sanhedrin* x. 1–4; *Aboth* ii. 7, iv. 1, 16, 17, v. 19; *Apocal. Baruch* xlv. 15, xlviii. 50, lxxiii. 5; 4 *Ezra* vi. 9, vii. 12, 13, 42, 43, viii. 1. Comp. Rhenferdius, *De saeculo futuro* (Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, 1736, pp. 1116–1171). Witsius, *De saeculo hoc et futuro* (Meuschen, *Nov. Test.* pp. 1171–1183). Schoettgen, *De saeculo hoc et futuro* (*Horae Hebraicae*, i. 1153–1158). Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae* on Matt. xii. 32. Wetzstein, *Nov. Test.* on Matt. xii. 32. Koppe, *Nov. Test.* vol. vi., *epist. ad Ephes. Exc.* i. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 38–43. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 212–217. Bleek, *Hebräerbrief*, ii. 1, 20 sqq. Riehm, *Lekrbegriff des Hebräerbriefes*, i. 204 sqq. Oehler in *Herzog's Real-Enc.* ix. 434 sq. (2nd ed. ix. 664 sq.). Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, 1866, p. 124. Weber, *System*, p. 354 sq.

latter in the fourth Book of Ezra, according to which, after the conclusion of the Messianic period, a deathlike silence of seven days takes place upon earth, which is followed by the dawn of the new and the setting of the old world (vii. 30, 31). According to these different views the Messianic period is either identified with the future or reckoned as belonging to the present world. The former, *e.g.* in the Targum of Jonathan on 1 Kings iv. 33: "The future world of the Messiah" (עֲלָמָא דְּאַחַי רְמַשִּׁיחָא), and Mishna, *Berachoth* i. 5, where the present world (הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה) and the days of the Messiah (יְמֵי מוֹת הַמָּשִׁיחַ) are opposed to each other, and therefore the latter identified with הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא. In the fourth Book of Ezra, on the contrary, the days of the Messiah are reckoned to the present world, and the future world does not begin till the last judgment, which follows the close of the Messianic period (see especially vii. 42, 43, with which indeed vi. 9 is not easily reconcilable). The book *Sifre* also distinguishes between "the days of the Messiah" and "the future world."⁷⁸ The older and original view is in any case, that which identifies the days of Messiah with the future עוֹלָם. For the "future course of the world" is in the first place nothing else than the future happy Messianic period (so too in the New Testament). It was not till a higher, a heavenly happiness was hoped for after the close of the Messianic kingdom, that the Messianic period was reckoned as belonging to the present *Olam*, and the renovation of the world not expected to take place till that period had ended. In later Jewish theology this view became the prevailing one (for particulars, see the literature named note 72). Sometimes a position between this world and the world to come is assigned to the Messianic period. This is already found in the Apocalypse of Baruch, lxxiv. 2, 3: Tempus illud (the Messianic time) finis est illius quod corrumpitur, et initium illius quod non corrup-

⁷⁸ See Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, 1866, p. 124.

pitur. . . . Ideo longe est a malis, et prope iis quae non moriuntur.

10. *The general resurrection.*⁷⁴ A general resurrection of the dead is to take place before the last judgment. So great a variety of views with respect to this point, however, prevails in Jewish theology, that it would lead us too far to enter into details.⁷⁵ Only the chief points can here be alluded to. The belief in a resurrection or reanimation of the dead (תְּחִיַּת הַמֵּתִים),⁷⁶ which is clearly and decidedly expressed for the first time in the Book of Daniel (xii. 2), was during our period already firmly established (comp. e.g. 2 Macc. vii. 9, 14, 23, 36, xii. 43, 44; Enoch li. 1; *Psalt. Salom.* iii. 16, xiv. 2 sqq.; Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 1. 3; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14; Apoc. Baruch xxx. 1–5, l. 1, li. 6; 4 Ezra vii. 32; *Testam. XII. Patriarch. Judae*, xxv.; *Benjamin* x.; *Shemoneh Esreh*, 2 Berachah; Mishna, *Sanhedrin* x. 1; *Aboth* iv. 22; comp. also *Berachoth* v. 2; *Sota* ix. 15, *fin.*). At least this applies with respect to all circles influenced by Pharisaism, and these formed by far the majority. Only the Sadducees denied the resurrection,⁷⁷ while the Alexandrian theology placed in its stead the immortality of the soul.⁷⁸ A

⁷⁴ The order is, according to 4 Ezra vii. 31–34: (1) The renovation of the world; (2) The general resurrection; (3) The last judgment. So also Gfrörer, ii. 272, 275, 285.

⁷⁵ Comp. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 176–181, 203–206. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 275–285, 308 sqq. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 307–310, 328–333, 349–351, 504–506. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina*, p. 338 sqq. Rothe, *Dogmatik*, ii. 2, pp. 68–71, 298–308. Oehler, *Theologie des A. T.* ii. 241 sqq. Herm. Schultz, *Alttestamentl. Theologie*, 2nd ed. pp. 713 sqq., 807 sqq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 98 sqq. (art. “Belebung der Todten”). Stähelin, *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1874, p. 199 sqq. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 360 sqq. Weber, *System*, p. 371 sqq. Gröbler, *Die Ansichten über Unsterblichkeit und Auferstehung in der jüdischen Literatur der beiden letzten Jahrh. v. Chr. (Stud. und Krit.* 1879, pp. 651–700).

⁷⁶ This expression, e.g. *Berachoth* v. 2; *Sota* ix. 15, *fin.*; *Sanhedrin* x. 1.

⁷⁷ Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 1. 4. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14.

⁷⁸ *Wisd.* iii. 1 sqq., iv. 7, v. 16. With respect to Philo, comp. Gfrörer, *Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie*, i. 403 sqq. According to Josephus

separation between the just and unjust in the intermediate state between death and the resurrection was as a rule accepted, a preliminary state of happiness or torment being allotted to departed souls (see especially Enoch xxii. and in 4 Ezra the section rejected in the usual Latin text, c. vi. 49–76, according to the computation of the Ethiopic translation, ed. Fritzsche, pp. 607–611).⁷⁹ The same expectation lies at the root of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 22). In the Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Ezra, receptacles (*promptuaria*), into which the souls of the righteous are received after death, are frequently spoken of (Apoc. Baruch xxx. 2; 4 Ezra iv. 35, 41, vii. 32; in the rejected section, c. vi. 54, 68, 74, 76, in Bensly, vv. 80, 95, 101). In many passages of the New Testament the hope comes forward, that immediately after death the removal to the state of supreme and heavenly happiness will take place (Luke xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. v. 8; Phil. i. 23; Acts vii. 59; Rev. vi. 9 sqq., vii. 9 sqq.), and this is not without analogy in the Jewish view, since here also the same is expected, at least for eminent men of God (not only for Enoch and Elijah, but *e.g.* also for Ezra and such as him, 4 Ezra xiv. 9: *tu enim recipieris ab hominibus et converteris residuum cum filio meo et cum similibus tuis usquequo finiantur tempora*).^{79a} Established and generally accepted views on this point were not however formed.⁸⁰ The Apocalypse of Baruch gives detailed disclosures on the *resurrection body* (l. 1–li. 6. Comp. also 4 Ezra vi. 71 in the rejected section; in Bensly, ver. 97). One main difference in the doctrine of the resurrection consists in the expectation

the Essenes also did not teach a resurrection, but the immortality of the soul, see *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 11. Comp. also the *Book of Jubilees* in Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 24.

⁷⁹ In Bensly, *The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation of the Fourth Book of Ezra* (1875), pp. 63–71, vv. 75–101.

^{79a} Comp. also Wetzstein, *Nov. Test.* on Luke xxiii. p. 322 sqq.

⁸⁰ Comp. also on the intermediate state Weber, *System*, p. 322 sqq.

of a resurrection of *the righteous only*, for the purpose of participating in the Messianic kingdom, or of a general resurrection (of the righteous and the ungodly) to judgment; and that at one time before the commencement of Messiah's reign, at another after its conclusion. The oldest form is certainly that first named (comp. note 65). It is found *e.g.* in *Psalt. Salom.* iii. 16, xiv. 2 sqq., but is also mentioned by Josephus as an average Pharisaic opinion (*Antt.* xviii. 1. 3; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14). The expectation of a *general resurrection* to judgment, is the extension of this older resurrection hope. So Daniel, Enoch, Apoc. Baruch, 4 Ezra, Testam. XII. Patriarch., and the Mishna in the above-cited places.⁸¹ Here again the distinction arises, as to whether the resurrection and judgment are expected before the commencement, or after the close of the Messianic period. The former view represented Dan. xii. 2, and Enoch li., is certainly the more ancient, for originally the object of the judgment was to inaugurate the Messianic period. Not till the Messianic blessedness ceased to be regarded as ultimate and supreme, was the judgment also, as the decision on man's final destiny, transferred to the close of the Messianic age. So especially Apoc. Baruch and 4 Ezra. In the *New Testament Apocalypse* the expectation of a resurrection of the just before the appearance of the Messianic kingdom is combined with that of a general resurrection after its close. The awakening itself takes place by the sounding of the *trump of God* (1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 16. Comp. Matt. xxiv. 31; 4 Ezra vi. 23).⁸²

11. *The Last Judgment. Eternal Salvation and Condem-*

⁸¹ In the Mishna, comp. especially *Aboth* iv. 22: "They who are born are destined to die; the dead to be awakened; the awakened to stand before the judgment-seat, that one may learn, teach, and be convinced that He is the Almighty," etc. In *Sanhedrin* x. 3 also the resurrection is assumed to be general, since it is said only exceptionally of certain prominent sinners, who have already in their lifetime received their judgment, that they will not rise to judgment.

⁸² See also Weber, *System*, p. 352 sq. Stähelin, *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1874, pp. 198, 220, and the commentaries on 1 Cor. xv. 52 and 1 Thess. iv. 16.

nation.⁸³ A last judgment at the close of the Messianic period can only be spoken of, when limited duration is ascribed to the Messianic kingdom. Hence among the older authorities it is only the Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Ezra which need here be considered. In the rest the judgment coincides with the destruction of the hostile powers, which takes place before the commencement of Messiah's reign (see above, No. 5). In the Apocalypse of Baruch, the judgment is but briefly alluded to (l. 4). The fourth Book of Ezra (vii. 33-35 and the rejected section, c. vi. 17, in Bensly, pp. 55-58) gives more detail. We here learn that it is God Himself who sits in judgment. Nor can there be any doubt from these two books, that on the day of judgment sentence will be passed not only on the people of Israel, but on the whole race of mankind (Baruch li. 4, 5; Ezra vi. 2, in Bensly, p. 55 sq.). It holds good as a general principle, that all Israelites are to share in the world to come (*Sanhedrin* x. 1: *בְּלִישְׁרָאֵל יֵשׁ לָהֶם חֵלֶק לְעוֹלָם הַבָּא*). It is self-evident however, that all the sinners of Israel (who are carefully catalogued in the Mishna, *Sanhedrin* x. 1-4) are excluded. Since sentence is to be passed upon each individual exactly in proportion to his works, the deeds of men are, during their lifetime, written in *heavenly books* (Enoch xlviii. 7, 8, liv. 7, also lxxxix.-xc. *Book of Jubilees* in Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 38, and elsewhere. *Test. XII. Patr. Aser* 7. Mishna, *Aboth* ii. 1. Luke x. 20; Phil. iv. 3; Rev. iii. 5, xiii. 8, xx. 15. *Hermas, Vis.* i. 3. 2),⁸⁴ and sentence is passed according to the contents of these books. The ungodly are cast into the fire

⁸³ Comp. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 206-211, 221-226. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 285 sqq., 311 sqq. Weber, *System*, p. 371 sqq.

⁸⁴ Comp. on these heavenly books, especially Harnack's note on *Hermas, Vis.* i. 3. 2; also Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* i. 551-562. Dillmann, *Das Buch Enoch*, p. 245. Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 83. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina*, pp. 385, 499.

of Gehenna (Baruch xliv. 15, li. 1, 2, 4, 6; Ezra vi. 1-3, 59, in Bensly, pp. 55 sq., 64).⁸⁵ This condemnation is as a rule regarded as everlasting.⁸⁶ But the view is also met with of a temporal duration to the punishments of hell, giving them only the signification of a purgatory.⁸⁷ The righteous and godly are received into Paradise, and dwell in the high places of that world, and see the glory of God and of His holy angels. Their countenance will shine like the sun, and they will live for ever (Dan. xii. 3; Baruch li. 3, 7-14; Ezra vi. 1-3, 68-72, in Bensly, pp. 55 sq., 69 sq. Comp. also *Assumptio Mosi* x. 9, 10).⁸⁸

⁸⁵ The Hebrew גֵּהֶנּוֹם, *Kiddushin* iv. 14; *Edujoth* ii. 10; *Aboth* i. 5, v. 19, 20. Frequently in the Targums and Talmud. In the New Testament γέεννα, Matt. v. 22, 29 sq., x. 28, xviii. 9, xxiii. 15, 33; Mark ix. 43, 45, 47; Luke xii. 5; Jas. iii. 6. Comp. also Enoch, ch. xxvii. and cviii. 4 sqq. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenth.* ii. 322-369. Lightfoot, *Horae* on Matt. v. 22. Wetzstein, *Nov. Test.* on Matt. v. 22. Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.*, col. 395 sq. Levy, *Chald. Wörterb.* i. 135 sq. Id. *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* i. 323. Tholuck and Achelis in their expositions of the Sermon on the Mount on Matt. v. 22. The Lexicons of the New Testament, s.v. γέεννα. Dillmann, *Das Buch Enoch*, p. 131 sq. Weber, *System*, p. 326 sqq. Elsewhere Hades and its darkness are designated as the future lot of the wicked, e.g. *Psalm.* Salom. xiv. 6, xv. 11, xvi. 2.

⁸⁶ Isa. lxvi. 24; Dan. xii. 2; Matt. iii. 12, xxv. 46; Luke iii. 17. *Test. XII. Patr.* *Sebulon* 10. *Aser* 7. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14: αἰδῖφ τιμωρία; *Antt.* xviii. 1. 3: εἰργμὸν αἰδῖου (both passages are given in their connection, vol. i. pp. 381 and 383). Comp. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 289.

⁸⁷ *Edujoth* ii. 10: "R. Akiba said, The execution of judgment upon Gog and Magog lasts twelve months, and the time of the condemnation of the ungodly lasts twelve months." In this however regard is had only to sinners who are *Israelites*.

⁸⁸ In Rabbinic Hebrew Paradise is generally called עֵדֶן (so e.g. *Aboth* v. 20), or also פֶּרֶדֶס, but the latter not so often (in the Mishna this word is used only of a park in the natural sense, *Sanhedrin* x. 6; *Chullin* xii. 1; *Arachin* iii. 2). In the *Test. XII. Patr.* both occur ('Εδέμ *Test. Dan.* 5, παράδεισος *Test. Levi* 18). In the New Testament παράδεισος, Luke xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. xii. 4; Rev. ii. 7. Much material in Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenth.* ii. 295-322. Wetzstein, *Nov. Test.* 818-820 (on Luke xxiii. 43). Comp. also Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* on Luke xxiii. 43; Schöttgen on 2 Cor. xii. 4 and Rev. ii. 7. The interpreters of these New Testament passages

12. *Appendix. The suffering Messiah.*⁸⁹ So far we have had no occasion to speak of the sufferings, or of any atoning death of the Messiah. For the prediction in the fourth Book of Ezra, that the Messiah should die after reigning 400 years (4 Ezra vii. 28, 29), has evidently nothing in common with the idea of an atoning death. But the question, whether Judaism in the age of Christ expected a suffering Messiah, and indeed a Messiah suffering and dying as an atonement for the sins of men, must not be left undiscussed. According to what has been said, the question seems answered, as indeed it has been by many (especially after the most thorough investigation by De Wette), in the negative. Others, on the contrary, as *e.g.* Wünsche, think it may be as decidedly answered in the affirmative. Certainly the sufferings of the Messiah are repeatedly spoken of in the Talmud. From the word *וְהָרִיחוּ*, Isa. xi. 3, it is inferred that God loaded the Messiah with commands and sorrows like mill-stones (*במעות*) (ויסורין כרחים).⁹⁰ In another passage Messiah is described as sitting at the gates of Rome and binding and unbinding His wounds.⁹¹ More important is it, that in Justin's *Dialogus cum Tryphone* it is repeatedly admitted, nay asserted as self-

general. Joh. Schulthess, *Das Paradies, das irdische und überirdische, historische, mythische und mystische* (Zürich 1816), p. 345 sqq. Arnold, art. "Paradies," in Ersch and Gruber's *Encykl.*, sec. iii. vol. xi. (1838), p. 304 sqq., especially 310 sqq. Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. Nov. Test.* p. 748 sqq. Klöpfer, *Commentar zum zweiten Korintherbrief*, p. 506 sqq. Weber, *System*, p. 330 sqq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 892–897 (art. "Paradies").

⁸⁹ Comp. De Wette, *De morte Jesu Christi expiatoria* (*Opusc.* c. pp. 1–148). Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 265–272. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* ix. 440 sq. (2nd ed. ix. 670 sq.). Wünsche, *יְסוּרֵי הַמָּשִׁיחַ* oder *Die Leiden des Messias*, Leipzig 1870. Delitzsch, *Sehet welch' ein Mensch!* (Leipzig 1872), pp. 13, 30 sq. Castelli, *Il Messia*, pp. 216–224, 329 sqq., 335 sqq. Weber, *System*, pp. 343–347. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 765–767 (art. "Messiasleiden"). De Wette as above, pp. 6–9, gives a list of the older literature.

⁹⁰ *Sanhedrin* 93b, given in Wünsche, *Die Leiden des Messias*, p. 56 sq.

⁹¹ *Sanhedrin* 98a, in Delitzsch, *Hebräerbrief*, p. 117. Wünsche, p. 57 sq.

evident by the representative of the Jewish standpoint, that the Messiah must suffer. "When we name to them (relates Justin, c. 68) the passages of Scripture, which clearly prove that the Messiah must suffer, and is to be worshipped, and is God, they admit unwillingly indeed, that the Messiah is there spoken of; but nevertheless they venture to maintain, that this (Jesus) is not the Messiah. On the contrary, they believe that He will first come and *suffer* and rule and be a God worthy of adoration." Still more decidedly does Trypho express himself in another passage, c. 89: Παθητὸν μὲν τὸν Χριστὸν ὅτι αἱ γραφαὶ κηρύσσουσι, φανερόν ἐστιν εἰ δὲ διὰ τοῦ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κεκατηραμένου πάθους, βουλόμεθα μαθεῖν, εἰ ἔχεις καὶ περὶ τούτου ἀποδείξαι. Here indeed only sufferings in general, and not atoning sufferings, are spoken of, and the idea of death by crucifixion is decidedly rejected. But passages are also found, in which, in conformity with Isa. liii. 4 sqq., a suffering for the sake of the human race is spoken of. Thus among other names that of *Chulja* (חִלְיָה the sick, or according to another reading חִלְיָה, the leper) is at one time attributed to the Messiah, and this is justified by an appeal to Isa. liii. 4: "Surely He has borne our sicknesses and taken upon Himself our sorrows; but we esteemed Him one stricken, smitten of God and afflicted."⁹² According to the book *Sifre*, R. Joses the Galilean says: "King Messiah has been humbled and made contemptible on account of the rebellious, as it is said, He was wounded for our transgressions, etc. (Isa. liii. 5). How much more will He make satisfaction therefore for all generations, as it is written, 'And the Lord laid on Him the iniquity of us all (Isa. liii. 6).'"⁹³ The latter passage already shows, that in the second century

⁹² *Sanhedrin* 98b, in Gfrörer, ii. 266. Wünsche, p. 62 sq.

⁹³ S. Wünsche, p. 65 sq. Delitzsch, *Paulus' Brief an die Römer* (1870), p. 82 sq. *Stellen aus späteren Midraschim und anderen Werken jüdischer Theologen bei Wünsche*, pp. 66-108

after Christ Isa. liii. 4 sqq. was in many circles explained of the Messiah.⁹⁴ This is confirmed by the saying of Trypho, in Justin's *Dial. c. Tryph. c. 90*: Παθεῖν μὲν γὰρ καὶ ὡς πρόβατον ἀχθήσεσθαι οἶδαμεν· εἰ δὲ καὶ σταυρωθῆναι κ.τ.λ. Thus the Jewish opponent of Justin admitted that Isa. liii. 7 is to be referred to the Messiah. Consequently it cannot be disputed, that in the second century after Christ the idea of a suffering Messiah, and indeed of a Messiah suffering as an atonement for human sin, was, at least in certain circles, a familiar one. *In this respect a thought, which in itself was quite current in Rabbinic Judaism, was applied to the Messiah*, viz. the thought that the perfectly righteous man not only fulfils all the commandments, but also atones by sufferings for sins that may have been committed, and *that the overplus suffering of the righteous man is of service to others*.⁹⁵ But however much the idea of a suffering Messiah is from these premises conceivable on the soil of Judaism, just as little did it become the prevailing view of Judaism. The, so to speak official, Targum Jonathan allows indeed the reference of Isa. liii. to the Messiah to remain on the whole, but denies the application to him of just those verses, which treat of the sufferings of the servant of God.⁹⁶ In not one of the numerous works discussed by us have we found even the slightest allusion to an atoning suffering of Messiah.

⁹⁴ R. Jose the Galilean was a contemporary of R. Akiba, and therefore lived in the first half of the second century after Christ (see vol. i. p. 378). R. Tarphon, who is probably identical with Justin's Trypho, was also a contemporary of both (see vol. i. p. 377). If then Trypho is ready to make these concessions, he thereby only represented views held in the circles of his Palestinian colleagues.

⁹⁵ See Weber, *System*, pp. 313-316.

⁹⁶ For particulars, see Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* ix. 441 (2nd ed. ix. 670 sq.). Weber, *System*, p. 344 sq. On the history of the interpretation of Isa. liii. by the Jews, comp. also Origenes, c. *Celsus*, i. 55; and especially Driver and Neubauer, *The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters*, 2 vols. (1) *Texts*; (2) *Translations*. Oxford and London 1876-77 (*Theol. Litztg.* 1877, p. 567 sq.).

That the Jews were far from entertaining such an idea, is abundantly proved by the conduct of both the disciples and opponents of Jesus (Matt. xvi. 22 ; Luke xviii. 34, xxiv. 21 ; John xii. 34). Accordingly it may well be said, that it was on the whole one quite foreign to Judaism in general.

§ 30. THE ESSENES.

THE LITERATURE.

- Triglandius, *Trium scriptorum illustrium de tribus Judaeorum sectis syntagma*, 2 vols., Delphis 1703.
- Joh. Gottlob Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus antiquitatum sacri codicis* (1748), pp. 215-240.
- Ugolini, *Trihaeresium*, etc., in his *Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum*, vol. xxii.
- Bellermann, *Geschichtliche Nachrichten aus dem Alterthume über Essäer und Therapeuten*, Berlin 1821.
- Credner, *Ueber Essäer und Ebioniten und einen theilweisen Zusammenhang derselben*, in Winer's *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* vol. i. No. 2 (1827), pp. 211-264, and No. 3 (1829), pp. 277-328.
- Gfrörer, *Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie*, vol. ii. (1831) pp. 299-356.
- Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie*, vol. i. (1834) pp. 439-497. The same, art. "Essäer," in Ersch and Gruber's *Allg. Encyklop.* § 1, vol. xxxviii. (1843) pp. 173-192.
- Frankel, *Die Essäer. A Sketch* (*Zeitschr. für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums*, 1846, pp. 441-461).
- Frankel, *Die Essäer nach thalmudischen Quellen* (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1853, pp. 30-40, 61-73).
- Lutterbeck, *Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, vol. i. (1852) pp. 270-322.
- Uhlhorn, art. "Essener," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* vol. iv. (1855) pp. 174-177 (2nd ed. iv. 341-344).
- Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, Pt. 3, Div. ii. (1st ed. 1852), 2nd ed. 1868, pp. 234-292 (3rd ed. 1881, pp. 277-338). The same, *Ueber den Zusammenhang des Essäismus mit dem Griechenthum* (*Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, pp. 401-433).
- Ritschl, *Ueber die Essener* (*Theol. Jahrb.* 1855, pp. 315-356). The same *Die Entstehung der altkathol. Kirche* (2nd ed. 1857), pp. 179-203.

- Mangold, *Die Irrlehrer der Pastoralbriefe* (1856), pp. 32–60.
- Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik* (1857), pp. 243–286. The same, *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* vol. i. 1858, p. 116 sqq.; iii. 1860, p. 358 sqq.; x. 1867, p. 97 sqq.; xi. 1868, p. 343 sqq.; xiv. 1871, p. 50 sqq.; xxv. 1882, p. 257 sqq.
- Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. iii. pp. 368 sqq., 388 sqq., 509 sqq.
- Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, vol. i. pp. 207–214.
- Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden* (3rd ed.), vol. iii. pp. 99 sqq., 657–663 (note 10).
- Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. iv. p. 483 sqq.
- Harnischmacher, *De Essenorum apud Judaeos societate*, Bonn 1866 (*Gymnasialprogramm*).
- Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, vol. i. pp. 282–306.
- Holtzmann in Weber and Holtzmann's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. ii pp. 74–89.
- Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine* (1867), pp. 166–175, 460–462.
- Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, vol. i. 2nd ed. pp. 132–146.
- Tidemann, *Het Essenisme*, Leiden 1868. The same, *Esseners en Therapeuten* (*Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1871, pp. 177–188). The same, *De apocalypse van Henoch en het Essenisme* (*Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1875, pp. 261–296).
- Westcott, art. "Essenes," in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*. Abbot gives additional literature in the American edition.
- Ginsburg, art. "Essenes," in *Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*. The same, *The Essenes, their history and doctrines*, London 1864.
- Benamozegh, *Storia degli Esseni*, Firenze 1865.
- Lauer, *Die Essäer und ihr Verhältniss zur Synagoge und Kirche*. Wien, Braumüller 1869 (a separate reprint from the *Austrian Quarterly Paper for Catholic Theology*, 7th year, no. 4).
- Lipsius, art. "Essäer," in *Schenkel's Bibellez.* vol. ii. pp. 181–192.
- Clemens, *Die Quellen für die Geschichte der Essener* (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1869, pp. 328–352).
- Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben*, vol. ix. 1871, pp. 30–56.
- Clemens, *Die essenischen Gemeinden* (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1871, pp. 418–431).
- Sieffert, *Christus und die Essäer (Beweis des Glaubens)*, 1873, pp. 481–508.
- Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, ii. 172–178 (art. "Essäer").
- Delaunay, *Moines et sibylles dans l'antiquité judéo-grecque*, Paris 1874.
- Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (2nd ed. London 1876), pp. 82–98, 349–419.
- Pick, *Die englische Literatur über die Essäer* (*Zeitschr. für die lutherische Theologie*, 1878, pp. 397–399).

Demmler, *Christus und der Essenismus* (*Theologische Studien aus Württemberg*, 1st annual course, 1880, pp. 29 sqq., 122 sqq.).

Bestmann, *Geschichte der christlichen Sitte*, vol. i. (1880) p. 308 sqq.

Lucius, *Der Essenismus in seinem Verhältniss zum Judenthum*, Strassburg 1881.

Reuss, *Gesch. der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments*, § 547.

Klöpffer, *Der Brief an die Colosser* (1882), pp. 76–95.

Kuenen, *Volksreligion und Weltreligion* (German ed. 1883), pp. 197–206.

Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums* (1884), pp. 87–149.

Apart from the great high road of Jewish life, there lived in Palestine in the time of Christ a religious community which, though it grew up on Jewish soil, differed essentially in many points from traditional Judaism, and which, though it exercised no powerful influence upon the development of the people, deserves our attention as a peculiar problem in the history of religion. This community, the Essenes or Essaeans, is generally, after the precedent of Josephus, placed beside the Pharisees and Sadducees as the third Jewish sect. But it scarcely needs the remark, that we have here to deal with a phenomenon of an entirely different kind. While the Pharisees and Sadducees were large political and religious parties, the Essenes might far rather be compared to a monastic order. There is indeed much that is enigmatical in them as to particulars. Even their name is obscure. Josephus generally calls them *Ἐσσηνοί*,¹ but also *Ἐσσαιοί*.² In Pliny they are called *Esseni*, in Philo always *Ἐσσαιοί*. When Philo asserts that their name is identical with *ὄσιοι*, this is but etymological trifling.³ In truth it is in any case of

¹ So on the whole fourteen times, *Antt.* xiii. 5. 9 (twice), xiii. 10. 6, xiii. 11. 2, xv. 10. 4, xv. 10. 5 (twice), xviii. 1. 2, xviii. 1. 5; *Vita*, c. ii.; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 2, ii. 8. 11, ii. 8. 13, v. 4. 2 (comp. Harnischmacher, p. 5).

² So *Antt.* xv. 10. 4, xvii. 13. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 3. 5, ii. 7. 3, ii. 20. 4, iii. 2. 1.

³ *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 12 (Mang. ii. 457): *διαλέκτου Ἑλληνικῆς παρώνυμοι ὀσιότητος*. *Ibid.* § 13 (Mang. ii. 459): *τὸν λεχθέντα ὀμίλος*

Semitic origin, though but very little has with any certainty been ascertained concerning it.⁴ The explanation formerly accepted by many, סִדְנִי , "Physicians," too little suits the peculiarity of the order, and has no support in the Greek $\theta\epsilon\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}$, the Essenes being never called "physicians," but only $\theta\epsilon\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha\acute{\iota} \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ (servants of God).⁵ The derivation, advocated e.g. by Ewald, Hitzig, Lucius and others, from סִדְקִי , pious, in the plural *stat. absol.* סִדְקִי , *stat. emphat.* סִדְקִי , which though not indeed occurring in either Hebrew or Chaldee, is only the more usual in Syrian, is that which is most suitable. The form Ἐσσηνοί corresponds with the former, Ἐσσαιῶι with the latter.⁶ The *origin* of the Essenes is as obscure as their name. Josephus first mentions them in the time of Jonathan the Maccabee, about 150 B.C.,⁷ and speaks expressly of one Judas an Essene in the time of Aristobulus I. (105–104 B.C.).⁸ According to this, the origin of the order would have to be placed in the second century before Christ. But it is questionable whether they proceeded simply from Judaism, or whether foreign and especially Hellenistic elements had not also an influence in their organization. To $\tau\omega\nu \text{Ἐσσαιῶν} \eta \delta\acute{o}\sigma\omega\nu$. Mang. ii. 632 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11. 1, ed. Gaisford): $\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha\iota \text{Ἐσσαιῶι} \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha} \tau\eta\nu \delta\sigma\acute{\iota}\omicron\tau\eta\tau\alpha, \mu\omicron\iota \delta\omicron\kappa\acute{\omega}, \tau\eta\varsigma \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\eta\gamma\omicron\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma \alpha\acute{\xi}\iota\omega\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. It seems to me improbable, that Philo was in these explanations thinking of the Semitic *chasê* (see Lucius, p. 89). On the contrary, he really derives the word from the Greek $\delta\sigma\acute{\iota}\omicron\tau\eta\varsigma$.

⁴ See the list of the different views in Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 285. Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2. 278, 3rd ed. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (2nd ed.), pp. 349–354. Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, p. 89 sq. Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte*, pp. 98–101.

⁵ Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 12 (Mang. ii. 457).

⁶ That an initial η followed by a sibilant may be represented in Greek by $\epsilon\sigma\sigma$ or $\alpha\sigma\sigma$ is seen e.g. from $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\eta\nu\eta\varsigma = \text{ἡση}$ (Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 7. 5, 8. 9), $\alpha\sigma\sigma\iota\delta\alpha\iota\omicron\iota = \text{סִדְקִי}$, $\text{Ἐσσεβῶν} = \text{הִשְׁבִּי}$. The formations by $\eta\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ and $\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ are in Hellenistic Greek used *promiscue*; hence an appeal to the Semitic *status absolutus* and *emphaticus* is not necessary to explain them; still a certain amount of influence upon the structure of the Greek forms may probably be attributed to them.

⁷ *Antt.* xiii. 5. 9.

⁸ *Antt.* xiii. 11. 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 3. 5.

answer this question, we must first of all bring forward the accounts of our authorities, viz. Philo,⁹ Josephus,¹⁰ and Pliny,¹¹ for the purpose of making upon these foundations some approximation to the origin and nature of Essenism.

I. THE FACTS.

1. *Organization of the community.* Philo and Josephus agree in estimating the number of the Essenes in their time at above 4000.¹² As far as is known, they lived only in Palestine, at least there are no certain traces of their occurrence out of Palestine.¹³ According to Philo, they lived

⁹ *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 12, 13 (*Opp.* ed. Mang. ii. 457-459); and the fragment in Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica*, viii. 11, accepted by Mangey. On the genuineness of the work, *Quod omnis probus liber*, see Lucius, pp. 13-23, and § 34, below.

¹⁰ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 2-13; *Antt.* xiii. 5. 9, xv. 10. 4-5, xviii. 1. 5.

¹¹ *Hist. Nat.* v. 17. The other authorities are either quite dependent on the three above named, or so scanty and unreliable as to be of scarcely any value. See generally on the authorities for the history of the Essenes, Bellermand, *Geschichtliche Nachrichten*, pp. 36-145. Clemens, *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1869, p. 328 sqq. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians*, etc., 2nd ed. p. 83 sq. Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, pp. 12-34. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr.* 1882, pp. 266-289. *Ketzergeschichte*, pp. 87-149. In Rabbinic literature (*Mishna*, *Tosefta*, *Talmud*, *Midrashim*), the Essenes are apparently nowhere mentioned, at least not under this name. When Jewish scholars (Frankel, Herzfeld, Jost, Grätz, Derenbourg, Geiger, Hamburger) have insisted on discovering them under other names, such identifications are some of them decidedly mistaken, some at least very questionable, as has been in most instances admitted by Geiger. See especially, *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, 1871, pp. 49-56.

¹² Philo, ed. Mangey, ii. 457. Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5. It seems to me scarcely doubtful, that Josephus has here made use of Philo. In the detailed description given by Josephus himself, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, the following points are missing: (1) The number 4000; (2) the repudiation of animal sacrifices; (3) agriculture as the prevailing occupation; (4) repudiation of slavery. All these points are mentioned by Philo, and inserted in the later account of Josephus, *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5, but certainly because they are found in Philo's account.

¹³ Whether the Christian ascetics of Rome (*Rom.* xiv.-xv.) and Colosse

chiefly in villages, avoiding towns because of the immorality of their inhabitants.¹⁴ Yet he himself says, in another passage, that they also dwelt in many of the towns of Judaea,¹⁵ while according to Josephus they were to be found in every town (of Palestine).¹⁶ Hence we should be much mistaken if we were, according to Pliny's description, to seek them only in

(Col. ii.) were Christianized Essenes is very questionable. The occurrence of Essenes in Syria only would be evidenced, if the traditional reading ἡ Παλαιστίνη καὶ Συρία in the passage of Philo's *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 12, Mang. ii. 457 (see next note), is the correct one. It is however highly probable that the reading is ἡ Παλαιστίνη Συρία. For (1) Eusebius, who also quotes the passage, reads ἡ ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ Συρία. (2) The expression ἡ Παλαιστίνη Συρία is also elsewhere used by Philo (*De nobilitate*, § 6. Mang. ii. 443: Θάμαρ ἦν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Παλαιστίνης Συρίας), and was moreover quite usual after Herodotus. See Herodot. i. 105: ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ Συρίῃ; ii. 106, the same; iii. 5, Σύρων τῶν Παλαιστίνῃ καλεομένων; iii. 91, Φοινίκη τε πᾶσα καὶ Συρία ἡ Παλαιστίνη καλεομένη. Joseph. *Antt.* viii. 10. 3, τὴν Παλαιστίνην Συρίαν. Polemon in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 10. 5 (ed. Gaisford), ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ καλουμένη Συρία. Dio Cass. xxxvii. 15, τὴν Συρίαν τὴν Παλαιστίνην. Still more material in Pape-Benseler, *Wörterb. der griech. Eigennamen*, s.v. Παλαιστίνη. Forbiger, *Geogr.* ii. 673 sq. Pauly's *Real-Enc.* v. 1070. Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerl. Verfassung des röm. Reichs*, ii. 183 sq. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. i. (1881), p. 420 sqq. Παλαιστίνη is here always an adjective (the Palestinian Syria). From the passages quoted it is also evident, that, in the passage of Philo cited above, the reading is not, as many insist, Παλαιστίνη Συρίας, but Συρία. See e.g. Wieseler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. xxi. 291 (art. "Timotheusbriefe").

¹⁴ Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 457: "Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ Παλαιστίνη [καὶ] Συρία καλοκάγαθίας οὐκ ἄγονος, ἣν πολυανθρωποτάτου ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὐκ ὀλίγη μοῖρα νέμεται. Λέγονται τινες παρ' αὐτοῖς ὄνομα Ἑσσαῖοι κ.τ.λ. . . Οὗτοι τὸ μὲν πρῶτον κωμηδὸν οἰκοῦσι, τὰς πόλεις ἐκτρεπόμενοι, διὰ τὰς τῶν πολιτενομένων χειροῇθεις ἀνομίας, εἰδότες ἐκ τῶν συνόντων ὡς ἀπ' αἰέρος φθοροποιῶ νόσου ἐγγιγνομένην προσβολὴν ψυχαῖς ἀνάτατον.

¹⁵ Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 632 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11, 1st ed. Gaisford): Οἰκοῦσι δὲ πολλὰς μὲν πόλεις τῆς Ἰουδαίας, πολλὰς δὲ κάμας, καὶ μεγάλους καὶ πολυανθρώπους ὁμίλους.

¹⁶ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 4: Μία δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῶν πόλις, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐκάστῃ κατοικοῦσι πολλοί. There were certainly Essenes in Jerusalem also, where they frequently make an appearance in history (*Antt.* xiii. 11. 2, xv. 10. 5, xvii. 13. 3; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 4), and where a gate was named after them (*Bell. Jud.* v. 4. 2, ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑσσηνῶν πύλην), probably because the house of their order was near it.

the desert of Engedi on the Dead Sea.¹⁷ On the contrary, the settlement there can only have been distinguished above others on account of its numbers. For the sake of living as a community, they had special houses of the order in which they dwelt together.¹⁸ Their whole community was most strictly organized as a single body. At the head were presidents (ἐπιμεληταί), whom the members were bound unconditionally to obey.¹⁹ Whoever desired to enter the order received three badges (the naming of which will hereafter be seen): a pickaxe (ἀξινάριον), an apron (περίζωμα), and a white garment (λευκὴν ἐσθῆτα). He was not, however, immediately received into the order, but had first to undergo a probation of one year, after which he was admitted to the lustrations. Then followed a further probation of two years. And not till this was ended was he allowed to participate in the common meals, and to become a full member after first taking a fearful oath. In this oath he had to bind himself both to absolute openness

¹⁷ *Hist. Nat.* v. 17: Ab occidente litora Esseni fugiunt usque qua nocent, gens sola, et in toto orbe praeter ceteras mira, sine ulla femina, omni venere abdicata, sine pecunia, socia palmarum. In diem ex aequo convenarum turba renascitur large frequentantibus quos vita fessos ad mores eorum fortunae fluctibus agit. Ita per seculorum milia (incredibile dictu) gens aeterna est. In qua nemo nascitur. Tam fecunda illis aliorum vitae poenitentia est. Infra hos Engada oppidum fuit, etc. Dio Chrysostomus (1st century after Christ) also, according to the testimony of his biographer Synesius, mentioned the Essenes as a community at the Dead Sea. Synesii *Opp.* ed. Petav. p. 39: ὅτι καὶ τοὺς Ἑσσηνοὺς ἐπαινεῖ που, πόλιν ὅλην εὐδαίμονα τὴν παρὰ τὸ νεκρὸν ὕδωρ ἐν τῇ μεσογείᾳ τῆς Παλαιστίνης κειμένην παρ' αὐτὰ που τὰ Σόδομα. Probably Pliny and Dio Chrysostomus draw from a common source. Comp. Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, pp. 30–33.

¹⁸ Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 632 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11. 5, ed. Gaisford): Οἰκοῦσι δ' ἐν ταύτῳ, κατὰ θιάσους ἑταιρίας καὶ συσσίτια ποιοῦμενοι, καὶ πάνθ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινωφελούς πραγματευόμενοι διατελοῦσιν. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5, says at least that at meals they εἰς ἴδιον οἶκημα συνίασιν, ἔνθα μηδενὶ τῶν ἑτεροδόξων ἐπιτίτραπται παρελθεῖν. Comp. also Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 458: Οὐδενὸς οἰκία τίς ἐστὶν ἰδίᾳ, ἣν οὐχὶ πάντων εἶναι συμβέβηκε. Πρὸς γὰρ τὸ κατὰ θιάσους συνοικεῖν, ἀναπέπτωται καὶ τοῖς ἐτέρωθεν ἀφικνουμένοις τῶν ὁμοζήλων.

¹⁹ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 6.

towards the brethren, and to secrecy concerning the doctrines of the order to non-members.²⁰ Only adults were admitted as members.²¹ But children were also received for the purpose of training in the principles of Essenism.²² When Josephus says that the Essenes were divided into four classes according to their time of entrance,²³ such children are to be understood by the first class, the two stages of the novitiate by the second and third, and the members proper by the fourth. Transgressions of members of the order were decided upon by a tribunal of at least one hundred of their fellow-members.²⁴ Those who had grievously transgressed were expelled from the community.²⁵

The strongest tie by which the members were united was absolute *community of goods*. "The community among them is wonderful, one does not find that one possesses more than another. For it is the law, that those who enter deliver up their property to the order, so that there is nowhere to be seen, either the humiliation of poverty or the superfluity of wealth, but on the contrary *one* property for all as brethren, formed by the collection of the possessions of individuals."²⁶ "They neither buy nor sell among each other; but while one gives to another what he wants, he receives in return what is useful to himself, and without anything in return they receive freely whatever they want."²⁷ "The managers (ἐπιμεληταί) of the common property are chosen; and each is selected by all for ministration of the possessions of the community."²⁸ "They choose fitting persons as receivers of revenues (ἀποδέκτας τῶν

²⁰ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 7.

²¹ Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 632 (= Euseb. *Præp. evang.* viii. 11, 3rd ed. Gaisford).

²² Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 2.

²³ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 10: Διήρηνται δὲ κατὰ χρόνον τῆς ἀσκήσεως εἰς μοῖρας τέσσαρας.

²⁴ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 9.

²⁵ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 8.

²⁶ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 3.

²⁷ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 4.

²⁸ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 3: Χειροτονητοὶ δὲ οἱ τῶν κοινῶν ἐπιμεληταί, καὶ αἵρεται πρὸς ἀπάντων εἰς τὰς χρεῖας ἕκαστοι.

προσόδων) and of the produce of the earth, and priests for the preparation of bread and food.”²⁹ So Josephus. And in accordance with this Philo declares “none desires to have any kind of property of his own, neither a house, nor a slave, nor an estate, nor flocks, nor anything at all that constitutes wealth. But by putting everything together without distinction, they enjoy the common use of all.”³⁰ “The wages which they earn by different kinds of work, they give to a chosen manager (*ταμίας*). He receives them and buys what is wanted, and dispenses abundant provision and whatever else human life requires.”³¹ “Not only have they food, but also clothing in common. Thick cloaks are ready for winter, and light overalls for summer, so that each may use them at his pleasure. For what one has is regarded as the property of all; and what all have as that of each individual.”³² “There is but *one* purse for all, and common expenses, common clothes and common food in common meals. For community of dwelling, of life and of meals is nowhere so firmly established and so developed as with them. And this is intelligible. For what they receive daily as wages for their labour, they do not keep for themselves, but put it together, and thus make the profits of their work common for those who desire to make use of it. And the sick are without anxiety on account of their inability to earn, because the common purse is in readiness for the care of them, and they may with all certainty meet their expenses from abundant stores.”³³

²⁹ *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5: Ἀποδέκτας ἡ τῶν προσόδων χειροτονοῦσι καὶ ὅπως ἡ γῆ φέροι ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς, ἱερεῖς τε διὰ ποιήσιν σίτου τε καὶ βρωμάτων.

³⁰ Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 632 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 4.).

³¹ Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 633 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11. 10): Ἐκ δὴ τῶν οὕτως διαφερόντων ἕκαστος τὸν μισθὸν λαβόντες ἐνὶ διδασίᾳ τῷ χειροτονηθέντι ταμίᾳ. Λαβὼν δ' ἐκεῖνος αὐτίκα τὰπιτῆδεια ἀνείται, καὶ παρέχει τροφὰς ἀφθόγους, καὶ τᾶλλα ὧν ὁ ἀνθρώπινος βίος χρειώδης.

³² Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 623 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11, 12).

³³ Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 458 sq.: Εἴτ' ἐστὶ ταμῆιον ἐν πάντων καὶ δαπάναι, καὶ κοινὰ μὲν ἐσθῆτες. κοινὰ δὲ τροφαὶ συσσίτια πεποιημένων. Τὸ γὰρ

As already intimated in the above quoted passages, it is self-evident, that in this strictly communistic life all the needy of the order would be cared for. If any one was sick, he was tended at the common expense. The old enjoyed a happy old age under the care of the younger, just as if they had had many and excellent children about them.³⁴ Every one had the right to help the needy from the common purse, according to his discretion. Only when relatives were in question, had he to obtain the consent of the managers (ἐπίτροποι).³⁵ Travelling members of the order found hospitality everywhere. Nay a special officer (κηδεμών) was appointed in every town, to care for the wants of travelling brothers.³⁶

The *daily labour* of the Essenes was under strict regulation. It began with prayer, after which the members were dismissed to their work by the presidents. They reassembled for purifying ablutions, which were followed by the common meal. After this they again went to work, to assemble again for their evening meal.³⁷ The chief employment of members of the order was agriculture.³⁸ They likewise carried on, however, crafts of every kind. On the other hand, trading was forbidden as leading to covetousness, and also the making

ὁμορόφιον ἢ ὁμοδιαίτον ἢ ὁμοτράπεζον οὐκ ἂν τις εὖροι παρ' ἑτέροις μᾶλλον ἔργῳ βεβαιούμενον. Καὶ μήποτ' εἰκότως; Ὅσα γὰρ ἂν μεθ' ἡμέραν ἐργασάμενοι λάβωσιν ἐπὶ μισθῷ, ταῦτ' οὐκ ἴδια φυλάττουσιν, ἀλλ' εἰς μέσον προτιθέντες κοινὴν τοῖς ἐθέλουσι χρῆσθαι τὴν ἀπ' αὐτῶν παρασκευάζουσιν ἀφέλειαν. Οἷτε νοσηλεύοντες οὐχ ὅτι κορίζειν ἀδυνατοῦσιν ἀμελοῦνται, πρὸς τὰς νοσηλείας ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν ἔχοντες ἐν ἐτοιμῇ ὡς μετὰ πάσης ἀδείας ἐξ ἀφθονωτέρων ἀναλίσκειν.

³⁴ Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 633 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11. 13)

³⁵ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 6. The managers (ἐπιμεληται, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 3; ἀποδέκται τῶν προσόδων, *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5; ταλῖαι, Philo, ii. 633 = Euseb. viii. 11. 10; ἐπίτροποι, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 6) seem to have been at the same time the presidents of the order. For the latter also are called ἐπιμεληται (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5, 6).

³⁶ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 4.

³⁷ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5.

³⁸ *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5: τὸ πᾶν ποιεῖν ἐπὶ γεωργίᾳ τετραμμένοι.

of weapons or of any kind of utensils that might injure men.³⁹

2. *Ethics. Manners and Customs.* The Essenes are described by both Philo and Josephus as very connoisseurs in morality. Josephus calls them *Βέλτιστοι ἄνδρες τὸν τρόπον*.⁴⁰ And Philo competes with him in sounding their praise.⁴¹ Their life was *abstemious, simple and unpretending*. "They condemn sensual desires as sinful, and esteem moderation and freedom from passion as of the nature of virtue."⁴² They only take food and drink till they have had enough; ⁴³ abstaining from passionate excitement, they are "just dispensers of wrath."⁴⁴ At their meals they are "contented with the same dish day by day, loving sufficiency and rejecting great expense as harmful to mind and body."⁴⁵ They do not cast away clothes and shoes until they are utterly useless.⁴⁶ They do not collect treasures of gold and silver, nor earn them from the desire to acquire large estates, but only what is needed for the wants of life.⁴⁷

Beside these general features of simplicity and moderation however, we meet in their moral principles, in their usages and customs, a series of *special points*, which we shall here simply enumerate, reserving the explanation of them for a later occasion. (1) There is not a *slave* among them, but *all* are free, mutually working for each other.⁴⁸ (2) "All that

³⁹ Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 457, 633 (= Euseb. viii. 11. 8-9).

⁴⁰ *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5.

⁴¹ Comp. especially what Philo says, ii. 458, concerning their instruction, with the matter of the oath, which according to Josephus each had to take on entering the community.

⁴² *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 2: τὰς μὲν ἡδονὰς ὡς κακίαν ἀποστρέφονται, τὴν δὲ ἡγνράτειαν καὶ τὸ μὴ τοῖς πάθειν ὑποκίπτειν ἀρετὴν ὑπολαμβάνουσι.

⁴³ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5, *fin.* The cause of rest and quietness at meals is ἡ διηνεκὴς νῆψις καὶ τὸ μετρεῖσθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς τροφὴν καὶ ποτὸν μέχρι κόρου.

⁴⁴ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 6: ὀργῆς ταμίαι δίκαιοι, θυμοῦ καθεκτικοί.

⁴⁵ Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 633 (= Euseb. viii. 11. 11).

⁴⁶ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 4.

⁴⁷ Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 457.

⁴⁸ Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 457: Δουλός τι παρ' αὐτοῖς οὐδὲ εἰς ἐστίν, ἀλλ'

they say is more certain than an oath. They forbid swearing, because it is worse than perjury. For that which does not deserve belief without an appeal to God, is already condemned."⁴⁹ (3) They forbid anointing with oil. And if one has been anointed against his will, he wipes it off. "For they regard a rough exterior as praiseworthy."⁵⁰ (4) Before every meal they bathe in cold water.⁵¹ They do the same after performing the functions of nature.⁵² Nay even mere contact with a member of the order of a lower class requires a purifying bath.⁵³ (5) They esteem it seemly to wear white raiment at all times,⁵⁴ on which account a white garment is delivered to each member on entrance.⁵⁵ (6) They behave with special modesty in performing natural functions. They dig with the pickaxe (σκαλῖς, ἀξινάριον), which each member receives, a hole of a foot deep, cover themselves with a mantle, that they may not offend the brightness of God (ὥς μὴ τὰς αὐγὰς ὑβρίζοιεν τοῦ θεοῦ), relieve themselves into the hole, and throw in again the earth that had been dug out. They choose the most solitary place for the purpose, and bathe afterwards as the unclean are accustomed to do. On the Sabbath they entirely abstain from the act.⁵⁶ Their modesty is also shown in other ways. In bathing they bind an apron about their loins.⁵⁷ They also avoid spitting for-

ἐλεύθεροι πάντες, ἀνθυπουργοῦντες ἀλλήλοις. Comp. Joseph. Antt. xviii. 1. 5: οὔτε δούλων ἐπιτιθεύουσι κτήσιν.

⁴⁹ Bell. Jud. ii. 8, 6: πᾶν μὲν τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἰσχυρότερον ὄρκου, τὸ μὲν μὲν περιίστανται, χεῖρόν τι τῆς ἐπιρκίας ὑπολαμβάνοντες· ἥδη γὰρ κατεγνώσθαι φασὶ τὸ ἀπιστούμενον δίχα θεοῦ. Comp. Antt. xv. 10. 4 (Herod exempts the Essenes from oaths). Philo, ii. 458: they teach τὸ ἀνῳμότου, τὸ ἀψευδές.

⁵⁰ Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 3: κηλῖδα δὲ ὑπολαμβάνουσι τὸ ἔλαιον, καὶ ἀλιφῇ τις ἄκων, σμύχεται τὸ σῶμα· τὸ γὰρ ἀύχμεῖν ἐν καλῷ τίθενται.

⁵¹ Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 5: ἀπολούονται τὸ σῶμα ψυχροῖς ὕδασι.

⁵² Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 9, fin.

⁵³ Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 10, init.

⁵⁴ Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 3: τὸ γὰρ ἀύχμεῖν ἐν καλῷ τίθενται, λευχεῖται μὲν τὸ δὲ αὖ παντός.

⁵⁵ Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 7.

⁵⁶ Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 9.

⁵⁷ Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 5.

wards or to the right hand.⁵⁸ (7) They *entirely condemned marriage*.⁵⁹ Josephus indeed knew of a branch of Essenes who permitted marriage.⁶⁰ But these must at all events have formed a small minority. For Philo says expressly: *Ἐσσαιῶν οὐδεὶς ἀγεται γυναῖκα*. (8) They sent gifts of incense to the temple, but *offered no animal sacrifices*, because they esteemed their own sacrifices more valuable. They were on this account excluded from the temple at Jerusalem.⁶¹ (9) Lastly, a chief peculiarity of the Essenes was their *common meals*, which bore the character of *sacrificial feasts*. The food was prepared by priests,⁶² with the observance probably of certain rites of purification; for an Essene was not permitted to partake of any other food than this.⁶³ The meals are described as follows by Josephus: "After the bath of purification they betake themselves to a dwelling of their own, entrance into which is forbidden to all of another faith. And being clean they go into the refectory as into a sanctuary. And after they have quietly taken their seats, the baker lays down the bread in order, and the cook sets before each a vessel with a single kind of food. The priest prays before the meal, and none may eat before the prayer. After the meal he prays again. At the beginning and end they honour God as the giver of food. Then they put off their garments as sacred and go back to their work till evening. Returning, they feed again in the same manner."⁶⁴ (10) The wide-spread opinion,

⁵⁸ Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 9: τὸ πτύσαι δὲ εἰς μέσους ἢ τὸ δεξιὸν μέρος φυλάσσονται.

⁵⁹ Philo, ii. 633-634 (= Euseb. viii. 11. 14-17). Joseph. Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 2; Antt. xviii. 1. 5. Plin. Hist. Nat. v. 17.

⁶⁰ Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 13.

⁶¹ Philo, ii. 457: οὐ ζῶα καταθύοντες, ἀλλ' ἱεροπρεπεῖς τὰς ἑαυτῶν διαβολὰς κατασκευάζειν ἀξιούντες. Joseph. Antt. xviii. 1. 5: εἰς δὲ τὸ ἱερόν ἀναθήματα στέλλοντες θυσίας οὐκ ἐπιτελοῦσι διαφορότητι ἀγνείων ἀς νομίζοιεν, καὶ δι' αὐτὸ ἐργόμενοι τοῦ κοινοῦ τεμενίσματος ἐφ' αὐτῶν τὰ θυσίας ἐπιτελοῦσι.

⁶² Antt. xviii. 1. 5.

⁶³ Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 8.

⁶⁴ Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 5. Undoubtedly we must behold in these meals the

that the Essenes abstained from the use of *meat* and *wine*, has no support from the older authorities, and has lately been rightly opposed by Lucius.⁶⁵ As indirect arguments are usually adduced (a) their rejection of animal sacrifices, the reason of which was, that the Essenes regarded the slaughter of animals in general as objectionable; and (b) the refusal of the kindred sects of the Therapeutae Pythagoreans and Ebionites to partake of meat and wine. It cannot however be proved, that their repudiation of animal sacrifices proceeded from the motives mentioned, and the degree of affinity between Essenism and the above-named tendencies respectively must first be ascertained from established facts. Jerome certainly ascribes to the Essenes an abstinence from flesh and wine. But his assertion can be proved to rest only upon gross carelessness in rendering the words of Josephus.⁶⁶

sacrifices (*θυσίαι*) which the Essenes, according to Josephus (*Antt.* xviii. 1. 5), regarded as of more value than those at Jerusalem. The *ἱματὶ ἐσθῆτες*, were certainly *linen* garments. For the Essenes always wore *white* raiment. Hence the distinctive quality of their sacred garments must have lain in their material.

⁶⁵ Lucius, *Die Therapeuten*, p. 38 f. The same, *Die Essenismus*, p. 56 f.

⁶⁶ Hieronymus *adv. Jovinian.* ii. 14 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ii. 343): Josephus in secunda Judaicae captivitatis historia et in octavo decimo antiquitatum libro et contra Apionem duobus voluminibus tria describit dogmata Judaeorum: Pharisaeos, Sadducaeos, Essaeos. Quorum novissimos miris effert laudibus, quod et ab uxoribus et vino et carnibus semper abstinuerint et quotidianum jejunium verterint in naturam. The commencement of these words proves, that Jerome was not in them using Josephus at all, but Porphyry, who in his work, *de abstinencia*, iv. 11–13, restores the account of Josephus (comp. *de abstinencia*, iv. 11: Ἰώσηπος . . . ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἱστορίας . . . καὶ ἐν τῷ ὀκτωκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας . . . καὶ ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῷ πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας; the last statement is a mistake, the sects not being mentioned in the books *contra Apionem*). But neither Josephus nor Porphyrius tells us anything about the Essenes abstaining from flesh and wine. Porphyrius himself certainly requires throughout his work abstinence from the use of flesh. But he is accurate enough not to introduce any extraneous matter into the narrative of Josephus (hence the statement in Lucius, p. 56, is incorrect; comp. also Zeller, p. 287). It was Jerome who first undertook this completion. But as he supports his assertion solely on Josephus, it is entirely without value. For the partaking

3. *Theology and Philosophy.* The view of the world held by the Essenes was fundamentally the Jewish. When Josephus ascribes to them belief in an unalterable fate, by which human freedom was absolutely abolished,⁶⁷ this must undoubtedly be understood only in the sense of an absolute belief in Providence.⁶⁸ And when he says that the Essenes make everything, the Sadducees nothing dependent on fate, while the Pharisees occupy a middle position between the two, thus much may be true, that the Essenes were particularly decided in their adherence to that belief in Providence, which they held in common with the Pharisees. The Essenes are in this point only decided Pharisees, as they are also in a high esteem for the Law and the Lawgiver. "Next to God, the name of the Lawgiver is with them an object of the greatest reverence, and whoever blasphemes it is punished with death."⁶⁹ "Their pursuit of ethic is especially thorough, since they take for instructors the laws of their fathers, which no human soul could possibly have conceived without Divine inspiration."⁷⁰ In their worship, as well as in that of other

of flesh and wine by the Essenes at least two probable reasons may be adduced: (1) According to Philo, ii. 633 = Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11. 8, they also carried on cattle-rearing. (2) Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5 declares the peace and silence of their meals to result from the circumstance, that they partook of meat and drink (τροφὴν καὶ ποτόν) only till they had had enough, which has no meaning unless they drank wine.

⁶⁷ Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 5. 9. Comp. xviii. 1-5: 'Εσσηνοῖς δ' ἐπὶ μὲν θεῷ καταλιπεῖν φιλεῖ τὰ πάντα ὁ λόγος.

⁶⁸ Comp. what is remarked above, p. 16, on the Pharisees.

⁶⁹ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 9: Σέβας δὲ μέγιστον παρ' αὐτοῖς μετὰ τὸν θεὸν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ νομοθέτου καὶ βλασφημία τις εἰς τοῦτον, κολάζεται θανάτῳ.

⁷⁰ Philo, ii. 458: Τὸ ἡθικὸν εὖ μάλα διαπονοῦσιν, ἀλείπταις χρώμενοι τοῖς πατρίοις νόμοις, οὓς ἀμήχανον ἀνθρωπίνην ἐπινοῆσαι ψυχὴν ἀνευ κατακωχῆς ἐνθέου. Comp. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8-12: βίβλοις ἱεραῖς καὶ διαφόροις ἀγνεύαις καὶ προφητῶν ἀποφθέγμασιν ἐμπαίδοτριβοῦμενοι. Whether, on the other hand, the Holy Scriptures are intended by the συγγράμμασι τῶν παλαιῶν, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 6, is questionable, since according to *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 7 the sect had also its special books.

Jews, the Holy Scriptures were read and explained; and Philo remarks, that they specially delighted in allegorical interpretation.⁷¹ They were extraordinarily strict in the celebration of the Sabbath. They did not venture on that day to move a vessel from its place, nor even to perform the functions of nature.⁷² In other respects too they showed themselves to be Jews. Though they were excluded from the temple they sent gifts of incense (ἀναθήματα) there.⁷³ And they seem to have kept to the priesthood of the house of Aaron.⁷⁴

On this decidedly Jewish foundation, it is self-evident, that any real worship of the sun is out of the question. When therefore Josephus declares that “daily before the rising of the sun, they address to it old traditional prayers, supplicating it, as it were, to rise,”⁷⁵ this cannot be meant in the sense of an *adoratio*, but only in that of an *invocatio* (observe the εἰς αὐτόν). Certainly such an *invocatio* is of itself striking in Jewish monotheists, as being apparently founded on the idea (so alien to Jewish consciousness), that the sun is the representative of the Divine light? That they did proceed upon the latter conception must be assumed from the motive stated

⁷¹ Philo, ii. 458. In explanation of the passage, comp. Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, p. 426; *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2. 293 sq.

⁷² *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 9.

⁷³ *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5.

⁷⁴ The question here is concerning the interpretation of the passage, *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5: Ἀποδέκτας δὲ τῶν προσόδων χειροτονοῦσι καὶ ὅποσα ἡ γῆ φέροι ἀνδρας ἀγαθοὺς, ἱερεῖς τε διὰ ποίησιν σίτου τε καὶ βρωμάτων. This is generally translated: “They choose excellent men as receivers of revenues and of what the earth produces, and (they choose just such men) as priests for the sake of the preparation of bread and food.” But it should rather be translated, “and (they choose) priests for the preparation of bread and food.” In the former case the meaning would be, that they knew of no hereditary, but only an elective priesthood; in the latter it would be stated, that they took their bakers and cooks out of the number of the priests (of the house of Aaron).

⁷⁵ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5: Πρὶν γὰρ ἀνασχεῖν τὸν ἥλιον οὐδὲν φθέγγονται τῶν βεβήλων, πατέριους δὲ τινὰς εἰς αὐτὸν εὐχάς, ὥσπερ ἱκετεύοντες ἀνατεῖλαι.

by them for their caution in the performance of their needs, viz. that they might not offend the brightness of God.⁷⁶

An intermingling of heterogeneous elements is here already found, and much that is peculiar and alien to traditional Judaism appears in their teaching in general. When indeed Josephus says, that whoever entered their order had to swear not to teach any of their ordinances (*δόγματα*) otherwise than he had himself received them,⁷⁷ it may, by reason of the extensiveness of the notion of *δόγμα*, be doubtful whether special *doctrines* are meant thereby. At any rate however the order was in possession of special books, the careful preservation of which was made the duty of the members.⁷⁸ And with respect to their doctrines certain peculiarities are at least known to us. They searched the writings of the ancients (it is not clear whether the books of the sect or the canonical Scriptures are meant) to discover what would profit the soul and the body, the sanatory powers of roots, and the properties of stones.⁷⁹ They must have highly estimated their angelology. The novice had to swear carefully to preserve the names of the angels.⁸⁰ By reason of their study of Scripture and their purifications they ensured a knowledge of the future, and Josephus asserts that they were seldom mistaken in their predictions,⁸¹ and gives several examples of correct prophecies by Essenes, *e.g.* by one Judas in the time

⁷⁶ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 9: ὡς μὴ τὰς αὐγὰς ὑβρίζουσιν τοῦ θεοῦ. The contrary assumption is incidentally met with in the *Testam. XII. Patriarch. Benjamin*, c. 8: ὁ ἥλιος οὐ μισαίνεται προσέχων ἐπὶ κόπρον καὶ βόρβορον, ἀλλὰ μάλλον ἀμφοτέρω ψύχει καὶ ἀπελαύνει τὴν δυσωδίαν.

⁷⁷ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 7: μηδενὶ μὲν μεταδοῦναι τῶν δογμάτων ἑτέρως ἢ ὡς αὐτὸς μετέλαβεν.

⁷⁸ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 7: συντηρήσειν ὁμοίως τὰ τε τῆς αἵρέσεως αὐτῶν βιβλία.

⁷⁹ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 6: Σπουδάζουσι δὲ ἐκτόπως περὶ τὰ τῶν παλαιῶν συγγράμματα, μάλιστα τὰ πρὸς ὠφέλειαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἐκλέγοντες. Ἐνθεν αὐτοῖς πρὸς θεραπείαν παθῶν ρίζαι τε ἀλεξητήριοι καὶ λίθων ιδιότητες ἐνερυνῶνται.

⁸⁰ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 7: συντηρήσειν . . . τὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων ὀνόματα.

⁸¹ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 12.

of Aristobulus I.,⁸³ one Menahem in the time of Herod,⁸³ and one Simon in the time of Archelaus.⁸⁴ Concerning their doctrine of the soul and of its immortality, Josephus expresses himself most fully. If we may trust his account, they taught that bodies are perishable, but souls immortal, and that the latter dwelt originally in the subtlest aether, but being debased by sensual pleasures united themselves with bodies as with prisons; but when they are freed from the fetters of sense they will joyfully soar on high, as if delivered from long bondage. To the good (souls) is appointed a life beyond the ocean, where they are troubled by neither rain, nor snow, nor heat, but where a gentle Zephyr is ever blowing. But to the bad (souls) is appointed a dark cold region full of unceasing torment.⁸⁵

II. NATURE AND ORIGIN OF ESSENISM.

Full as are the descriptions of our authorities, especially Josephus, the question from what point of view these various phenomena are to be explained, and from what general views and motives they proceed, remains to this day undecided. Some (and they now form the majority) insist on explaining Essenism wholly from Judaism, regarding it either as virtually identical with Pharisaism, or at least deriving it (with all its divergences) from Chasidaeic or Pharisaic Judaism. So especially the Jewish scholars Frankel, Jost, Grätz, Derenbourg, Geiger, and among Christian scholars, Ewald, Hausrath,

⁸³ *Antt.* xiii. 11. 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 3. 5.

⁸³ *Antt.* xv. 10. 5.

⁸⁴ *Antt.* xvii. 13. 3; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 7. 3.

⁸⁵ *Bell. Jud.* 8. 11: Καὶ γὰρ ἔρρωται παρ' αὐτοῖς ἥδε ἡ δόξα, φθαρτὰ μὲν εἶναι τὰ σώματα καὶ τὴν ὕλην οὐ μόνιμον αὐτοῖς, ταῖς δὲ ψυχαῖς ἀθανάτους αἰεὶ διαμένειν, καὶ συμπλέκεσθαι μὲν, ἐκ τοῦ λεπτοτάτου φοιτῶσας αἰθέρος, ὥσπερ εἰρηταῖς τοῖς σώμασιν ἴσχυι τινι φυσικῇ κατασπαμέναις, ἐπειδὴν τότε χαίρειν καὶ μετεώρους φέρεσθαι κ.τ.λ.

Tideman, Lauer, Clemens, Reuss, and Kuenen. Ritschl advocates this standpoint in a peculiar manner. He regards Essenism as only a consistent carrying out of the idea of the universal priesthood (Ex. xix. 6). He endeavours to explain all the single facts from one, viz. that the Essenes desired to be a nation of priests. Similarly Bestmann, only he does not see in Essenism the carrying out of the idea of the universal, but of the Aaronic priesthood. Lucius also esteems Essenism as a purely Jewish formation, and explains its origin from the exclusively "pious" having in the Maccabæan period renounced the Jerusalem temple-worship, because they regarded it as illegitimate. From this renunciation of the temple-worship, all the peculiarities of Essenism are to be explained. In another manner again did Hilgenfeld formerly derive Essenism purely from Judaism. He thought (in his work on *Jewish Apocalypse*, 1857, p. 243 sqq.), that the Essenes must be regarded as merely a school of Jewish apocalyptics. The object of their asceticism (as in Dan. x. 2, 3; Enoch lxxxiii. 2, lxxxv. 3, 4; Ezra ix. 24-26, xii. 51) was, he says, solely that of making themselves worthy and capable of receiving revelations. "It was the higher illumination, the reception of revelations especially by dream-visions, which they sought in this way to attain" (p. 253). Hilgenfeld, after defending this view in his *Zeitschrift* for 1858, p. 116 sqq., hinted already in that for 1860 at the possibility of Persian influence. Subsequently, in that for 1867, p. 97 sqq., he sought decidedly to prove, that not only Parseeism, but also Buddhism had exercised essential influence upon the formation of Essenism, to which view he adhered for a longer time (1868, p. 343 sqq.; 1871, p. 50 sqq.).⁸⁶ In his more

⁸⁶ In a certain sense he had already a predecessor in Philo, who adduces as examples of asceticism first the Persian *Magi*, then the Indian *Gymnosophists*, and immediately after the Essenes (*Quod omnis probus liber*, § 11, 12, ed. Mang. ii. 456, 457: 'Εν Πέρσαις μὲν τὸ Μάγαν, . . . 'Εν Ἰνδοῖς

recent publications he again insists upon the Jewish foundation and admits only Parsee influences (*Zeitschr.* 1882, p. 299; *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*, pp. 141–149); he thinks the Essenes were originally Rechabites, who settled in a place called Essa, westward of the Dead Sea (*Zeitschr.* 1882, pp. 268 sqq., 286 sqq.; *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*, pp. 100 sqq., 139 sqq.).⁸⁷ Lightfoot also (*St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, 2nd ed. pp. 355–396) adopts the opinion of a virtual Jewish foundation, with secondary Parsee influence. Lipsius too declares the origin of Essenism to be chiefly Jewish; he however concedes the co-operation of foreign influences, only not on the part of Greek philosophy or Parseeism, and still less of Buddhism, but on that of Syro-Palestinian heathenism. The development of Essenism “took place entirely on Palestinian soil” (*Bibellexikon*, ii. 189, 190). While all the above-named regard Essenism as exclusively or chiefly a Jewish product, Lutterbeck, Zeller, Mangold and Holtzmann, following the precedent of Baur and Gfrörer, explain some more, some fewer, of the peculiarities which distinguish Essenism from traditional Judaism, by the influence of Pythagoreanism, with which Josephus (*Antt.* xv. 10. 4) had already compared Essenism. It was especially Zeller, who in his discussions with Ritschl sought, on the basis of his comprehensive acquaintance with Greek philosophy, to point out parallels with Pythagoreanism in nearly all points. Herzfeld occupied a medium position, by finding that in

δὲ τὸ Γυμνοσφιστῶν, . . . “Ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ ἡ Παλαιστίνη [καὶ] Συρία καλοκά-
γαθίας οὐκ ἄγονος κ.τ.λ.).

⁸⁷ This place, Essa west of the Dead Sea, has been fabricated by Hilgenfeld purely *ad hoc*. He is himself only able to point out an “Essa in Peræa, which is identical with Gerasa (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 15. 3, comp. with *Bell. Jud.* i. 4. 8). He thinks however that the name means “foundation,” and may therefore occur as the name of several places. But unfortunately this “Essa in Peræa does not exist at all, since the reading must be Γέρασα, by reason of *Bell. Jud.* i. 4–8, and also the parallel passage, *Antt.* xiii. 15. 3 Comp. note 257, vol. i. p. 117.

Essenism "a Judaism of quite peculiarly blended ultra-Pharisaic and Alexandrian views appears in alliance with Pythagoreanism and with many rites of Egyptian priests" (iii. 369). Keim too is of opinion, that while all the peculiarities of Essenism might be derived from Judaism, the parallels between Pythagoreanism and Essenism are too numerous and striking to suffer us to dispute the influence of the former upon the latter (*Gesch. Jesu*, i. 300 sqq.).

It is not easy to find a way out of this labyrinth of views. The question will be simplified by first subjecting to an examination the peculiar hypotheses of Ritschl, Lucius, and Hilgenfeld. 1. The hypothesis of Ritschl is tempting, inasmuch as the Essenes certainly desire to exhibit, like the Israelitish priests, a condition of special purity and holiness. Hence the parallels between the two are very numerous. On the other hand however it leaves essential points unexplained, especially their rejection of animal sacrifices, marriage, the oath, and the anointing oil.⁸⁸ It is impossible to deduce all these phenomena satisfactorily from a single standpoint. 2. And still less is this the case if the point is that chosen by Lucius. His attempt to explain all the singularities of the Essenes by their rupture with the illegitimate worship at Jerusalem may be designated a failure. For how should they have thus arrived at their rejection of marriage, oaths, slavery, trading, and their peculiarly puritanical tendency in general?⁸⁹ In other respects too this starting-point is unfortunately chosen. For if the Essenes agreed, as Lucius admits, with the Pharisees in their legalistic tendencies, they had, at least after the time of Alexandra, no longer any reason for withdrawing from the temple-worship, since all sacred rites were then performed in

⁸⁸ Comp. Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, p. 413 sqq. *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2. 315 sqq.

⁸⁹ Against Lucius, see also my notice in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1881, 492-496.

a thoroughly correct manner. 3. The same objections as those against Ritschl and Lucius virtually apply to Hilgenfeld's earlier view of the Essenes as a community of Apocalyptic. Here too several peculiarities are left unexplained.⁹⁰ *If Essenism in general can be regarded as a purely Jewish formation, it is certainly most simple to view it as a climax of the Pharisaic tendency, for its starting-point and many of its peculiarities are identical with those of the latter. Hence the question may be simplified to: Is Essenism nothing more than a peculiar offshoot of Pharisaism, or did foreign and alien influences co-operate in its origin and development? And if the latter question be answered in the affirmative, what were these influences, Buddhism (as in Hilgenfeld's earlier view), Parseeism (Hilgenfeld and Lightfoot), Syro-Palestinian heathenism (Lipsius), or lastly, the Orphéo-Pythagorean tendency of the Greeks (Zeller and others)?*

It cannot be denied that very many, nay, most particulars may be explained from the Judæo-Pharisaic basis. Two main features especially, *the rigid legalism and the punctilious care for ceremonial cleanness*, are genuinely Pharisaic. Their high regard for the great lawgiver *Moses* and for the Holy Scriptures, their strict, nay, rigorous Sabbath-keeping, place them completely on the soil of Judaism. Their non-observance of certain precepts of the law, those especially concerning animal sacrifices, may have been the result either of some case of necessity or of an allegorical interpretation of the laws in question. In any case, it is not inconsistent with their unconditional acknowledgment of the formal authority of the law. Then their punctilious care for purity is essentially Pharisaic. The value attributed to Levitical purity, and to the baths and lustrations by which this was restored when defilement had been incurred, is a characteristic of Pharisaism.⁹¹

⁹⁰ Comp. Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2. 315 sqq.

⁹¹ Tertullian, *De baptismo*, c. 15: *Ceterum Israel Judæus quotidie lavat*,
DIV. II. VOL. II.

Especially is the Essenian bathing before meals analogous to practices of Pharisaic Judaism, and is at most an increase of the Pharisaic custom.⁹² Bathing after the performance of natural functions was required at least of officiating priests.⁹³ If then this was required by the Essenes of all the members of their association, it only shows that they desired to realize in themselves the highest degree of purity according to Jewish notions. We are also vividly reminded of Pharisaic views by the Essenian custom of bathing even after contact with a member of the order of a lower grade (*i.e.* a novice). For just what the unclean Am-haarez was to the Pharisees, was the novice not actually admitted into the society to the Essenes. *Essenism then is in the first place merely Pharisaism in the superlative degree.* From the effort to carry out completely the purity of life thus required may be explained also the Essenian separation, their organization in narrow and exclusive communities. If the Pharisee avoided as much as possible all intercourse with the unclean Am-haarez, the Essene completely separated himself from the multitude and formed exclusive societies, in which similarity of disposition and endeavour afforded the possibility of realizing the ideal of a

quia quotidie inquinatur. When Hemerobaptists (= καθ' ἡμέραν βαπτίζομενοι) are mentioned by Epiphanius, *haer.* xvii., as a Jewish sect, we have but the fabrication of a special sectarian name from a characteristic peculiarity of all Jews.

⁹² Ev. Mark vii. 3, 4: οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐὰν μὴ πυγμῇ νίψονται τὰς χεῖρας οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν . . . καὶ ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς ἐὰν μὴ βαντίσωνται (αἱ βαπτίσωνται) οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν. Comp. also Matt. xv. 2; Luke xi. 38. *Chagigah* ii. 5: "For the partaking of Chullin (profane food), tithe and heave, the hands must be washed (properly poured upon); for the eating of holy things they must first be dipped" (the latter precept applies only to those who partake of "holy" food, *i.e.* food proceeding from sacrifices). Comp. also p. 111. Bathing the whole body before eating cannot be shown to be a general precept in Rabbinic literature. The interpretation of the New Testament passages is questionable.

⁹³ *Joma* iii. 2. Comp. concerning the cleanness required of the priests, vol. i. p. 278.

life of absolute ceremonial cleanness. The *common meals* of these societies, the food for which was prepared by the priests, were a guarantee to the Essene that only clean food would be set before him. This close brotherly connection led to *community of goods*. The strict requirements made from members of the order made it necessary to admit new members into the society only after a long and strict *novitiate*. The purity and holiness which the Essenes strove to realize were indeed different, more exalted and special than those of the Pharisees. But almost all their peculiarities had at least their starting-point in Pharisaism. Their *white raiment* corresponded with the official dress of Israelitish priests, and therefore only shows, that the Essenes desired to manifest the highest degree of Jewish purity and holiness.⁹⁴ . . . Their *caution* in bathing,⁹⁵ and even their custom of not spitting forwards or to the right has its analogues in the Talmud.⁹⁶ Their *repudiation of marriage* is indeed a matter quite heterogeneous to genuine Judaism.⁹⁷ But even this may be explained from Jewish premises. For since the act of marriage as such made an individual unclean and necessitated a Levitical bath of purification,⁹⁸ the effort to attain to the highest degree of

⁹⁴ According to *Berachoth* 61^b, it was forbidden to perform the functions of nature towards the east or the west (it was allowed only towards the north or the south) to prevent exposure towards the temple.

⁹⁵ According to Mishna, *Berachoth* iii. 5, if any one happened to be bathing at the time for praying the Shema, and had not time to rise up and clothe himself, he must at least cover himself with water. *Bab. Berachoth* 24^b requires of any one unclothed before praying the Shema to wind the Tallith round his neck or his heart, that the upper parts of his body may not see the shame. See Herzfeld, iii. 389. Comp. also Lucius, p. 68.

⁹⁶ According to *Jer. Berachoth* iii. 5, it was forbidden to spit forwards or to the right at prayer; see Herzfeld, iii. 387. This custom is observed to this very day.

⁹⁷ Comp. on the *debitum tori*, *Jebamoth* vi. 6: "No one must withdraw from the duty of propagation, unless he has children already, according to the school of Shammai two sons, according to that of Hillel at least a son and daughter." Also *Kethuboth* v. 6, 7; *Gittin* iv. 5; *Edujoth* i. 13, iv. 10.

⁹⁸ Joseph. *Apion*. ii. 24: καὶ μετὰ τὴν νόμιμον συνουσίαν ἀνδρὸς καὶ

purity might well lead to the entire repudiation of marriage. In all these points a surpassing of ordinary Judaism is apparent, and this is also the case in the strongly puritanical trait, by which the Essenian mode of life is characterized. They saw in many of the social customs and institutions, which the development of culture entailed, a perversion of the primitive and simple ways of life prescribed by nature. They thought therefore that they manifested true morality by *a return to the simplicity of nature and of natural ordinances*. Hence their rejection of *slavery, oaths, anointing oil, and of luxury* in general; hence their principle of living a simple life and allowing themselves only so much food and drink as nature required. It cannot be shown that they practised actual asceticism by fastings and mortifications, by abstinence from flesh and wine. It was only the exceeding what nature required that they condemned.⁹⁹ *Their rejection of trade* is quite in accordance with this ethic radicalism; they desired a communistic state, in which each worked for the whole body, and none enriched himself at the expense of others.

If the bounds of ordinary Judaism are exceeded by the traits already depicted, this is still more the case in the extremely striking fact of the repudiation of animal sacrifices. That the point of view set up by Lucius in explanation of this fact does not lead to the goal, has been already remarked.¹⁰⁰ The sole point of contact for it, on Jewish ground, seems to me, on the contrary, to be the contention of many of the prophets against the over-estimation of sacrifice. As the prophets insist, that God does not take

γυναικὸς ἀπολούσασθαι καλεῖται ὁ νόμος. Comp. Ex. xix. 15; Lev. xv. 16-18; Deut. xxiii. 11, 12.

⁹⁹ The prohibition of the use of anointing oil during the stricter kinds of fasts by Pharisaic Judaism (*Taanith* i. 6; *Joma* viii. 1; comp. Dan. x. 3; Matt. vi. 17) does not therefore fall under quite the same point of view. It was to be a total abstinence.

¹⁰⁰ Comp. also *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1881, p. 494.

pleasure in sacrifices, but in purity of intention, so, according to the Essenian view, not the slaughter of beasts, but the sanctification of the body is true worship.

This also is based upon a certain amount of moral radicalism. But the rejection of animal sacrifices involves a complete *breach with Judaism proper*, which is not done away with by the fact, that the Essenes used to send gifts of incense to the temple at Jerusalem. A still stranger phenomenon presented on Jewish soil is their peculiar conduct with respect to the sun. It is quite impossible that their *εὐχὴ εἰς τὸν ἥλιον* can be only the Jewish Shema repeated before sunrise;¹⁰¹ on the contrary, they turned towards the sun while praying, because they saw in it the representative of the Divine light. This is proved especially by the circumstance, that in doing their needs they carefully avoided uncovering themselves towards the sun. The information too of Epiphanius, that the Ossaïans (who are certainly identical with the Essenes) had united with the Sampsitae, *i.e.* adorers of the sun, leads to the conclusion, that they were in real earnest in their religious estimation of the sun.¹⁰² However this may be, the very turning to the sun in prayer was contrary to Jewish customs and notions, which on the contrary required the turning to the temple, and expressly repudiated the direction towards the sun as heathenish.¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ So most Jewish scholars, also Derenbourg, p. 169, note 3. Comp. on saying the Shema before sunrise, *Berachoth* i. 2, and on the Shema in general, p. 83 sq.

¹⁰² See Epiphanius, *haer.* xx. 3 : καὶ Ὀσσαίων τὸ λείμμα οὐκέτι ἰουδαΐζον, ἀλλὰ συναφθέν Σαμψίταις τοῖς κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἐν τῷ πέραν τῆς νεκρᾶς θαλάσσης ὑπερκειμένοις. Comp. also Epiphanius, *haer.* xix. 2, liii. 1-2. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians*, etc., 2nd ed. pp. 88, 374 sq. The identity of the Essenes and Ossaïans is scarcely doubtful, though Epiphanius treats them as two different sects, *haer.* x. and xix. (Lightfoot, p. 83). He correctly explains (*haer.* liii. 2) the name Σαμψαῖος by Ἡλιακοί (from *שמש*, the sun).

¹⁰³ See especially Ezek. viii. 16 sqq. According to *Sukka* v. 4, two priests used to blow with trumpets in the morning at cock-crowing at the

Thus are we more and more driven to the view, that foreign influences co-operated in the formation of Essenism. And this becomes undoubted, if the account given of its *Anthropology* by Josephus is even in the main trustworthy. For if it really taught the pre-existence of the soul and regarded the body as only the soul's prison, this is of itself a proof of the influence of foreign philosophemes. Thus the question concerning the origin of Essenism is changed into the question concerning the trustworthiness of Josephus. This is not indeed utterly above suspicion, and we have already seen (above, p. 16 sq.), that he has given a Greek tinge to the teaching of the Pharisees and clothed their Jewish doctrine in a Greek garment. But we also saw that all that he says of them is in substance true, and that it is only the form which is derived from without. If then only one sentence which he says concerning the anthropology of the Essenes is true, it is certain that their doctrine of man is dualistic, *i.e.* non-Jewish. And there is the less ground for doubting this, since from this point of view many of their peculiarities, especially their efforts after purity, surpassing as they did even those of Phariseism, are most simply and naturally explained.

But what foreign influences have we then to consider? No

feast of Tabernacles, first of all at the door which led from the court of the men to the court of the women, then at the eastern door of exit from the latter; hereupon they turned towards the west (*i.e.* towards the temple) and said, with reference to Ezek. viii. 16: "Our fathers, who were in this place, turned their backs to the temple of God and their faces to the east and worshipped the sun towards the east. But we turn our eyes to God." When it is said in the Wisdom of Solomon, that we ought to prevent the sun with thanksgiving to God, and to pray to God *πρὸς ἀνατολὴν φωτός*, *πρὸς* has not a local but a temporal meaning: "towards sunrise," like Luke xxiv. 29, *πρὸς ἑσπέραν*; comp. Grimm, *Exeget. Handb. zu Sap. Sal.* xvi. 28. The matter too adduced by Lucius (pp. 61, 69 sq., note 125) to explain Essenian customs from a Jewish standpoint is not convincing. Its irrelevance is well pointed out by Lightfoot (pp. 374-376), who conjectures that the Sampsitae are merely an offshoot of the Essenes.

less than four different factors have been proposed, viz. Buddhism, Parseeism, Syrian heathenism, and Pythagoreanism. Each of these factors *may* in fact have exerted an influence upon intellectual life in Palestine during the last centuries before Christ; and for this very reason an answer to the above question must remain an uncertain one. Buddhism seems the most far-fetched. But when we consider, that an acquaintance with India had already been opened to the Western nations by the victories of Alexander the Great, that afterwards Megasthenes, in the time of Seleucus I. Nicator, *i.e.* about 300 B.C., furnished, on the ground of his own observations during a prolonged sojourn in India, a thorough description of the country and its inhabitants,¹⁰⁴ and that a regular commercial intercourse with India by way of the Red Sea probably existed during the Graeco-Roman period,¹⁰⁵ when also the striking parallel in some instances between Buddhism

¹⁰⁴ See the extensive fragments of Megasthenes in Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* ii. 397–439. Comp. also concerning him Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iv. 1721. Nicolai, *Griech. Literaturgesch.* ii. 170 sq. The work of Megasthenes seems to have been for a long time the main source of information concerning India. Strabo however availed himself also of other authors of the retinue of Alexander the Great as authorities (*e.g.* Aristobulus, Nearchus, Onesikritus). For other *Ἰνδικά*, see Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iv. 688b below; Nicolai, *Griech. Literaturgesch.* ii. 170 sq. That certain chief points were matters of general knowledge is seen from Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 11. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vii. 8. 7 (ed. Bekker, p. 160, lin. 20 sqq.). Lassen in his *Indische Alterthumskunde*, vol. ii. (2nd ed. 1874) pp. 626–751, gives a history of Greek acquaintance with India. Comp. the careful discussion in Lightfoot's *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians*, etc., pp. 390–396, and the two works cited by him, viz. Reinand, *Relations Politiques et Commerciales de l'empire romain avec l'Asie centrale*, Paris 1863; and Priaulx, *The Indian Travels of Apollonius of Tyana and the Indian Embassies to Rome*, 1873.

¹⁰⁵ Comp. especially the *Periplus maris Erythraei* mentioned above, pp. 37 and 44, and the literature cited in the preceding note. In the time of Augustus political embassies also came from India to Rome (*Monumentum Ancyranum*, v. 50, 51, and Mommsen, *Res gestae divi Augusti*, 1883, p. 132 sq. Strabo, xv. 1. 4, p. 686, and xv. 1. 73, p. 719. Dio Cass. liv. 9. Sueton. *Aug.* 21. Orosius, vi. 21. 19).

and Essenism is considered, the *possibility* at least of an actual connection cannot be disputed. It is true, that the still very scanty intercourse between India and the West in pre-Christian times makes this connection improbable.¹⁰⁶ It is more obvious to think of Parseeism or Pythagoreanism; for the points of contact with Syrian heathenism are but very general, and affect at most only individual details. In *Parseeism*, on the other hand, we find a whole series of the characteristic peculiarities of the Essenes: the lustrations, the white garments (for the Magi), the adoration of the sun, the repudiation of animal sacrifices proper (*i.e.* the presentation of the flesh to the Deity), and especially their angelology and magic. Since too ordinary Judaism seems to have been affected by Parseeism (see vol. i. p. 350), the assumption of Parsee influence is a very obvious one, since it would be only somewhat stronger in Essenism than in the latter.¹⁰⁷ But other points again are not at all Parseeistic, especially celibacy and the entire anthropology.¹⁰⁸ Hence all things considered, the hypothesis adopted especially by Zeller, that the peculiarities of Essenism are to be explained from Pythagorean influences, has the largest amount of probability in its favour. For Pythagoreanism, of all the hitherto named tendencies, shows the greater number of parallels with

¹⁰⁶ See, on the other hand, Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2. 323. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians*, etc., pp. 390–396. The attempts recently made to point out Indian influences in other departments also are questionable, nay, more than questionable. This applies especially to Seydel, *Das Evangelium von Jesu in seinen Verhältnissen zu Buddha-Sage und Buddha-Lehre*, Leipzig 1882 (on the other hand, *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1882, p. 415 sqq.). The same, *Die Buddha-Legende und das Leben Jesu nach den Evangelien*, Leipzig 1884 (on the other hand, *Theol. Litztg.* 1884, p. 185 sqq.). On Pythagoras, Schroeder, *Pythagoras und die Inder*, Leipzig 1884 (on the other hand, *A. W. in the Lit. Centralbl.* 1884, No. 45).

¹⁰⁷ See Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1867, p. 99 sqq. The same, *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*, p. 141 sqq. Lightfoot, p. 387 sqq.

¹⁰⁸ See Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2. 320 sqq.

Essenism. It shares its aspirations for bodily purity and sanctity, its lustrations, its simple habits of life apart from all sensual enjoyments, its high estimation (if not exactly its requirement) of celibacy, its white garments, repudiation of oaths, and especially its rejection of bloody sacrifices, also the invocation of the sun and the scrupulosity with which all that was unclean (such as human excrements) was hidden from it;¹⁰⁹ and lastly, the dualistic view of the relation of soul and body. All these belong equally to the ideal of both the Essenes and Pythagoreans.¹¹⁰ If an actual connection between the two is by reason of this far-reaching accordance, to say the least, very probable, this probability is increased by the fact, that a new light is thus cast upon even those peculiarities of Essenism, which may be explained from a Jewish foundation. They thus become, not the result of a spontaneous development, but of a fertilization of Judaism by new factors. These latter exercised a power of attraction over Judaism, because they found therein a series of points of contact for their own elective affinity.

Such an influence of Pythagoreanism upon a Jewish circle, leading to the formation of this separate sect upon Jewish soil, is historically easy of explanation. Essenism is met with at the earliest about the middle of the second century before Christ. But Pythagoreanism, if not as a settled school of philosophy, still as a view of life and a practice of morals, is far more ancient. As then Greek culture must have had a powerful influence upon Palestine since the time of Alexander

¹⁰⁹ That the adoration of the sun formed part of the Pythagorean ideal is seen especially from the biography of Apollonius of Tyana by Philostratus (comp. Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2, p. 155, note 1). The effort too to avoid the sight of what was unclean is genuinely Pythagorean. Comp. Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, p. 425. Mangold, *Irrlehrer der Pastoralbriefe*, p. 52.

¹¹⁰ See the proofs in Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, p. 401 sqq.; *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2, p. 325 sqq.

the Great,—it was not repressed until the Maccabaeae rising,—it is only natural, if we find actual proof of this influence of Hellenism in the circle of the Essenes. *Thus Essenism would be a separation from the soil of Judaism proper, which was perhaps effected in the second century before Christ, under Greek influences, with the view of realizing an ideal akin to Pythagoreanism, but with an adherence to its Jewish foundation.*¹¹¹

One thing alone prevents our establishing this result with certainty, and this is the enigmatical form of Pythagoreanism itself. Just those peculiarities, which it has in common with Essenism, are themselves not genuinely Greek, but *very probably of Oriental origin*. May not then their coincidence be explained by the fact, that each of the two has independently drawn from a common Oriental source? This would again lead to a derivation of Essenism mainly from Parsee influences. The possibility of this cannot be denied. But possibly both Parsee and Pythagorean influences were in operation. The different currents of culture frequently cross each other on the soil of Western Asia in so chequered and manifold a manner that it is impossible to answer such questions with certainty. Two things however may be established as the result of our investigation: (1) That Essenism is first and mainly a *Jewish* formation; and (2) that in its non-Jewish features it has most affinity with the Pythagorean tendency of the Greeks.

¹¹¹ The question whether the *Therapeutae* were offshoots of the Essenes or *vice versa* (answered by Zeller at first in the former, but subsequently in the latter sense) must now be left undiscussed, since the only work which gives us any information concerning the *Therapeutae*, viz. Philo, *De vita contemplativa* (Mang. ii. 471–486), is certainly spurious, and the *Therapeutae* very probably merely Christian monks. See below, § 34. 1.

§ 31. JUDAISM IN THE DISPERSION. PROSELYTES.

THE LITERATURE.

- Remond, *Versuch einer Geschichte der Ausbreitung des Judenthums von Cyrus bis auf den gänzlichen Untergang des Jüdischen Staats*, Leipzig 1789.
- Gieseler, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, vol. i. Div. i. (4th ed. 1844) p. 53 sqq.
- Winer, *RWB.*, art. "Exil" (i. 357-360) and "Zerstreuung" (ii. 727-730). Also the articles on separate cities, as "Alexandria," "Antiochia," "Cyrene," "Rom," etc.
- J. G. M(üller), art. "Alexandrinische Juden," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. i. (1854) pp. 235-239.
- Reuss, art. "Hellenisten," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. v. 701-705 (2nd ed. v. 738-741).
- Lutterbeck, *Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, vol. i. (1852) pp. 89-120.
- Frankel, *Die Diaspora zur Zeit des zweiten Tempels* (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1853, pp. 409-429, 449-463).
- Frankel, *Die Juden unter den ersten römischen Kaisern* (*Monatsschr.* 1854, pp. 401-413, 439-450).
- Jost, *Gesch. der Israeliten*, vol. ii. pp. 239-344. The same, *Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, vol. i. pp. 336 sqq., 344-361, 367-379.
- Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. iii. pp. 425-579. The same, *Handels-geschichte der Juden des Alterthums*, 1879.
- Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vol. iii. 3rd ed. (1878), pp. 26-54.
- Champagny, *Rome et la Judée au temps de la chute de Néron*, vol. i. (Paris 1865) pp. 107-154.
- Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. iv. p. 305 sqq., v. 108 sqq., vi. 396 sqq.
- Holtzmann in Weber and Holtzmann's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. ii. pp. 38-52, 253-273.
- Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 2nd ed. vol. ii. 91-145, iii. 383-392.
- Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, vol. iii. (1871) pp. 504-517. The same, *De Judaeorum coloniis*. Regimonti Pr. 1876 (*Progr.*).

- Deutsch, art. "Dispersion," in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*.
 Westcott, art. "Dispersion," in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*.
 Weizsäcker, art. "Zerstreuung," in Schenkel's *Bibellez.* v. 712-716.
 Huidekoper, *Judaism at Rome B.C. 76 to A.D. 140*, New York 1876 (comp. *Theol. Litztg.* 1877, p. 163).
 Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. (1883) art. "Zehn Stämme," "Zerstreuung," also "Alexandria," "Antiochia," "Rom," etc.

I. EXTENSION.

The history of the Jews during the times of Christ is not confined to the narrow limits of the Holy Land. Jewish communities of greater or less magnitude and importance had settled in almost all the countries of the then civilised world. These remained, on the one hand, in constant communication with the mother country, and on the other, in active intercourse with the non-Jewish world, and thus became of great importance both in respect of the internal development of Judaism and its influence upon other civilised nations. The *causes of this dispersion* were of very different kinds. In former times the Assyrian and Babylonian conquerors of Israel violently deported large masses of the nation into their eastern provinces. This occurred again, though to a less extent, when Pompey *e.g.* carried off hundreds of Jewish captives to Rome. Of greater importance however were the voluntary emigrations of Jewish settlers during the Graeco-Roman period to the countries bordering on Palestine, and to all the chief towns of the then civilised world for the sake chiefly of trade. It was especially at the commencement of the Hellenistic period, that these migrations were most numerous. The Diadochoi and their successors, for the sake of consolidating their kingdoms, promoted to the uttermost of their power the intermingling of the different nationalities, and consequently migrations from one province to another. They were also frequently in need

of great masses of settlers for their newly founded towns. And in both of these interests the rights of citizenship or other privileges were in many places granted without further ceremony to immigrants. Attracted by these circumstances, large numbers of Jews also were induced to settle in other lands. Adverse events at home may also have contributed their part, and especially the exposed situation of Palestine, which in all complications between Egypt and Syria became the scene of war. This induced many thousand Jews to emigrate to the neighbouring countries of Syria and Egypt, where, especially in the capitals Antioch and Alexandria, and in all the newly founded Hellenistic cities, valuable privileges were bestowed upon them. They next resorted to Asia Minor, particularly the towns of the Ionic coast, as well as to all the more important ports and commercial cities of the Mediterranean Sea.

Hence the Sibyllist was able, about the year 140 B.C., to say of the Jewish people, that every land and every sea was filled with them.¹ About the same time (139–138 B.C.) the Roman Senate despatched a circular in favour of the Jews to the kings of Egypt, Syria, Pergamos, Cappadocia and Parthia, and to a great number of provinces, towns and islands of the Mediterranean Sea (1 Macc. xv. 16–24). It may hence be safely inferred, that there was then already a greater or less number of Jews in all these lands.^{2a} Strabo, speaking of the time of Sulla, says (about 85 B.C.), that the Jewish people had already come into every city, and that it was not easy to find

¹ *Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 271: Πᾶσα δὲ γαῖα σέθεν πλήρης καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα.

^{2a} Besides the kings of Egypt, Syria, Pergamos, Cappadocia and Parthia, there are also named in 1 Macc. xv. 16–24: Sampsame (Samsun on the Black Sea?), Sparta, Sicyon (in Peloponnesus), the islands of Delos and Samos, the town of Gortyna in Crete, the country of Caria with the towns of Myndos, Halicarnassus and Cnidos, the islands of Cos and Rhodes, the country of Lycia with the town of Phasaelis, the country of Pamphylia with the town Side, the Phoenician town Aradus, and finally Cyprus and Cyrene.

a place in the world which had not received this race, and was not occupied by them.^{2b} Josephus³ too and Philo⁴ express themselves incidentally in a similar manner. The extent of the Jewish dispersion is most amply described in the epistle of Agrippa to Caligula, given by Philo. Jerusalem—it is here said—is the capital not only of Judaea, but of most countries, by reason of the colonies which it has sent out on fitting occasions into the neighbouring lands of Egypt, Phoenicia, Syria, Coelesyria, and the still more remote Pamphylia and Cilicia, into most parts of Asia as far as Bithynia, and into the most distant corners of Pontus; also to Europe, Thessaly, Boeotia, Macedonia, Etolia, Attica, Argos, Corinth, and the most and best parts of Peloponnesus. And not only is the continent full of Jewish settlements, but also the more important islands,—Euboea, Cyprus, Crete,—to say nothing of the lands beyond the Euphrates. For all, with the exception of a small portion of Babylon and those satrapies which embrace the fertile land lying around it, have Jewish inhabitants.⁵ The Acts of the Apostles also mention Jews and their associates from Parthia, Media, Elam, and Mesopotamia, from Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia,

^{2b} Strabo in Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2: εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν ἤδη παρεληλύθει, καὶ τόπον οὐκ ἔστι βραδίας εὐρεῖν τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅς οὐ παραδέδεκται τοῦτο τὸ φύλον, μηδ' ἐπικρατεῖται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

³ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 16. 4 (Bekker, p. 188): οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης δῆμος ὁ μὴ μοῖραν ὑμετέραν ἔχων. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 3. 3: τὸ γὰρ Ἰουδαίων γένος πολὺ μὲν κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην παρέσπαρται τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις.

⁴ Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 7 (Mang. ii. 524): Ἰουδαίους γὰρ χώρα μία διὰ πολυανθρωπίαν οὐ χωρεῖ. Ἦς αἰτίας ἕνεκα τὰς πλείστας καὶ εὐδαιμονεστάτας τῶν ἐν Εὐρώπῃ καὶ Ἀσίᾳ κατὰ τε νήσους καὶ ἡπείρους ἐκνέμονται, μητρόπολιν μὲν τὴν Ἱερόπολιν ἡγούμενοι, καθ' ἣν ἱδρύται ὁ τοῦ ὑψίστου θεοῦ νεὸς ἅγιος, ὃς δ' Ἰλαρχον ἐκ πατέρων καὶ πάππων καὶ προπάππων καὶ τῶν ἔτι ἄνω προγόνων οἰκεῖν ἕκαστοι, πατρίδας νομίζοντες, ἐν αἷς ἐγεννήθησαν καὶ ἐτρέφθησαν· εἰς ἐνίας δὲ καὶ κτιζομένας εὐθὺς ἤλθον ἀποικίαν στείλαμενοι, τοῖς πλείσταις χαρίζμενοι.

⁵ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 36, Mang. ii. 587.

Egypt and Cyrene, from Rome, Crete and Arabia (Acts ii. 9-11).

In Mesopotamia, Media, and Babylonia lived the descendants of those members of the kingdom of the ten tribes and of the kingdom of Judah who had once been carried away thither by the Assyrians and Chaldeans.⁶ The "ten tribes" never returned at all from captivity,⁷ and even in the times of Akiba there were disputes as to whether they would ever do so.⁸ Nor must the return of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin be conceived of as complete. Nay, these exiles subsequently received fresh accessions. For the Persian king Artaxerxes Ochus, on his return from his Egyptian campaign (about 340 B.C.), brought with him Jewish captives also, and planted them in Hyrcania on the Caspian Sea.⁹ These Jewish settlements may also have been increased by voluntary additions. From all these causes the Jews in those provinces were numbered, not by thousands, but by millions.¹⁰ Since

⁶ Comp. on the different deportations, Winer, *Realwörterb.*, art. "Exil." On the localities, see note 14, below.

⁷ Joseph. *Antt.* xi. 5. 2. 4 Ezra xiii. 39-47. Origen, *Epist. ad Africanum*, § 14.

⁸ *Sanhedrin* x. 3, *fin.*: "The ten tribes never return, for it is said of them (Deut. xxix. 27): He will cast them into another land, as it is this day. As then this day departs and never returns, so too are they to depart and never return. As the day becomes dark and then again light, so will it one day be light again to the ten tribes with whom it was dark."

⁹ Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 486: Ὁχος Ἀρταξέρξου παῖς εἰς Αἴγυπτον στρατεύων μερικὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν εἶλεν Ἰουδαίων, ὧν τοὺς μὲν ἐν Ὑρκανίᾳ κατήκτισε πρὸς τῇ Κασπίᾳ θαλάσῃ, τοὺς δὲ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι, οἳ καὶ μέχρι νῦν εἰσιν αὐτόθι, ὡς πολλοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἱστοροῦσιν. Orosius, iii. 7: Tunc etiam Ochus, qui et Artaxerxes, post transactum in Aegypto maximum diuturnumque bellum plurimos Judaeorum in transmigrationem egit atque in Hyrcania ad Caspium mare habitare praecepit: quos ibi usque in hodiernum diem amplissimi generis sui incrementis consistere atque exim quandoque erupturos opinio est. Kürzer in the *Chronik des Eusebius und Hieronymus ad annum Abr.* 1657 (ed. Schoene, ii. 112 sq.). Syncellus alone speaks of a settlement in Babylon; other authorities mention only the settlement in Hyrcania on the Caspian Sea.

¹⁰ Joseph. *Antt.* xi. 5. 2: Αἱ δὲ δέκα φυλαὶ πέραν εἰσὶν Εὐφράτου ἕως δεῦρο,

they dwelt on the eastern borders of the Roman Empire,—till Trajan, as subjects of the Parthians, and subsequently as inhabitants of those eastern provinces which could never be securely maintained by the Romans,¹¹—their attitude was always of political importance to the empire. P. Petronius, legate of Syria, esteemed it dangerous in the year 40 B.C. to excite in them a hostile disposition towards Rome.¹² During the Vespasian war the insurgents sought to incite their co-religionists beyond the Euphrates to hostilities against Rome.¹³ It was a great peril for Trajan in his advance against the Parthians to be menaced in his rear by the insurrection of the Mesopotamian Jews (see § 21). Josephus names the strong cities of Nehardea (*Νάαρδα*) and Nisibis, the former on the Euphrates, the latter in its valley, as the chief dwelling places of the Babylonian and Mesopotamian Jews.¹⁴ Both

μυριάδες ἄπειροι καὶ ἀριθμῷ γνωσθῆναι μὴ δυνάμεναι. *Antt.* xv. 2. 2: ἐν Βαβυλῶνι . . . ἔνθα καὶ πλῆθος ἦν Ἰουδαίων. On the history of the Babylonian Jews, comp. especially *Antt.* xviii. 9. Reference is sometimes at least made in the Mishna to the Jews of Babylonia and Media. See *Shekalim* iii. 4 (the half-shekel tax of Babylonia and Media); *Challa* iv. 11 (the first-born not accepted from Babylonia); *Joma* vi. 4 (the Babylonians plucked the wool of the scape-goat on the day of atonement); *Menachoth* xi. 7 (Babylonian priests); *Baba mezia* iv. 7, *Shabbath* vi. 6 (Median Jewesses); *Baba kamma* ix. 5 = *Baba mezia* iv. 7 (restitution for plundered property is binding as far as Media); *Shabbath* ii. 1, *Nasir* v. 4, *Baba bathra* v. 2 (Nahum the Mede). The Book of Tobit also proves that Jews dwelt in Media (Tob. i. 14, iii. 7, etc.).

¹¹ On the political history, see Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. i. (1881) pp. 435–438.

¹² Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 33, Mang. ii. 578.

¹³ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 6. 2 (p. 108, line 19 sq., ed. Bekker). Titus reproaches the Jews that καὶ πρεσβεῖαι μὲν ὑμῶν πρὸς τοὺς ὑπὲρ Εὐφράτην ἐπὶ νεωτερισμῷ.

¹⁴ Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 9. 1 and 9, *fin.* On Nehardea (נְהַרְדָּא), see Pauly's *Real-Enc.* v. 375 sq. (s.v. Naarda). Ritter, *Erdkunde*, x. 146. Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, ii. 852 sq. On Nisibis, Pauly's *Real-Enc.* v. 659 sq. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xi. 413 sqq. Nisibis was not on the Euphrates, as might appear from Josephus, but on the Mygdonius, an affluent of the Chaboras, which again is an affluent of the Euphrates. It formed the centre of the localities mentioned 2 Kings xvii. 6, xviii. 11, to which the members

cities were in subsequent centuries chief seats of Talmudic Judaism, and are therefore frequently mentioned in the Babylonian Talmud.¹⁵

Josephus names Syria as the country in which was the largest percentage of Jewish inhabitants, and its capital, Antioch, was especially distinguished in this respect.¹⁶ Other cities of Syria also numbered their Jewish inhabitants by thousands; this was the case with Damascus, where, according to the statement of Josephus, 10,000 or (according to another passage) 18,000 Jews are said to have been assassinated at the time of the war.¹⁷ Philo tells us of Asia also, as of Syria, that Jews dwelt in *large numbers in every city*.¹⁸ Aristotle, during his sojourn in Asia Minor (348–345 B.C.), had a meeting with an educated Jew, who had come thither, who *Ἑλληνικὸς ἦν οὐ τῇ διαλέκτῳ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ*. Clearchus, a disciple of Aristotle, gives in his book on sleep further particulars concerning this

of the kingdom of the ten tribes were carried by the Assyrians (see Gesenius' *Thesaurus*, and Winer's *Realwörterbuch* on the articles הָלַח, הָבֹר, גֹּזָן, מֵדָי, Halach, Habor, Gozan, Media; and the commentaries on 2 Kings xvii. 6, xviii. 11). Nehardea, on the other hand, lay farther southward in Babylonia proper. Thus around Nisibis were grouped the descendants of the ten tribes, and around Nehardea the descendants of the tribes of Benjamin and Judah, increased in both instances by subsequent additions. For Rabbinical matter on the abode of the ten tribes, see Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr. in epist. 1 ad Corinthios*, addenda ad c. xiv. (*Opp.* ed. Roterodam. ii. 929–932); Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 1281 sqq. (art. "Zehn Stämme"). Comp. also 4 Ezra xiii. 39–47, and above, p. 170.

¹⁵ See Berliner *Beiträge zur Geographie und Ethnographie Babylonien im Talmud und Midrash* (Berlin 1884), pp. 47 sqq., 53 sq. נְעָרֵי הָעִיר is also already mentioned in the Mishna, *Jebamoth* xvi. 7.

¹⁶ *Bell. Jud.* vii. 3. 3: Τὸ γὰρ Ἰουδαίων γένος πολὺ μὲν κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην παρίσπασται τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις, πλεῖστον δὲ τῇ Συρίᾳ κατὰ τὴν γειτονίᾳ ἀνακειμένην, ἐξαιρέτως δ' ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχείας ἣν πολὺ διὰ τὸ τῆς πόλεως μέγεθος. Comp. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* s.v. Antiochien.

¹⁷ 10,000, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 2. 18,000, *Bell. Jud.* vii. 8. 7 (p. 161, 27, ed. Bekker).

¹⁸ Philo, *ad Legat. Cajum*, § 33, Mang. ii. 582: Ἰουδαῖοι καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν εἰσι παμπληθεῖς Ἀσίας τε καὶ Συρίας.

meeting.¹⁹ Antiochus the Great settled 2000 Jewish families from Mesopotamia and Babylonia in Phrygia and Lydia.²⁰ And to mention nothing else, the Roman edicts in favour of the Jews communicated by Josephus (*Antt.* xiv. 10, xvi. 6), and the entire history of the Apostle Paul, show how widely the Jews had spread over the whole of Asia Minor. The statement of Agrippa in his epistle cited above, that Jews had settled in Bithynia and in the most distant corners of Pontus,²¹ is abundantly confirmed by the Jewish inscriptions in the Greek language found in the Crimea.²²

But most important with regard to the history of civilisation was the Jewish Dispersion in Egypt and especially in Alexandria.²³ Long before the time of Alexander the Great

¹⁹ The account of Clearchus is preserved by Josephus, *contra Apionem*, i. 22 (p. 200 sq., ed. Bekker). Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* ix. 5, has the history from Josephus. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* i. 15. 70, also briefly notices the matter. Comp. Müller, *Fragmenta Hist. Graec.* ii. 323 sq. Gutschmid, *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Orients* (1876), p. 77.

²⁰ *Antt.* xii. 3. 4.

²¹ Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 587: ἄχρι Βιθυνίας καὶ τῶν τοῦ Πόντου μυχῶν. Comp. also Acts xviii. 2 (Aquila, a Jew of Pontus).

²² See a Jewish inscription from Pantikapaion (on the Cimmerian Bosphorus) of the year 377 aer. Bosp. = A.D. 81, in the *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. ii. p. 1005 (addenda, n. 2114^{bb}). Another from Anapa (also in the Crimea) of the year 338 aer. Bosp. = A.D. 42 in Stephani, *Pererga archaeologica* (*Bulletin de l'Académie de St. Pétersbourg*, vol. i. 1860, col. 244 sqq.). See also Caspari, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, iii. (1875) p. 269. The Hebrew inscriptions from the Crimea, some of which Chwolsen thought might be referred to even the first century after Christ (Chwolsen, *Achtzehn hebräische Grabschriften aus der Krim*, *Mémoires de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, vii.^e Série, vol. ix. 1866, No. 7), are much more modern, the dates which decide the question having been fabricated by Firkowitsch. See the proof in Strack (*A. Firkowitsch und seine Entdeckungen, ein Grabstein der hebräischen Grabschriften der Krim*, Leipzig 1876) and Harkavy (*Altjüdische Denkmäler aus der Krim*, *Mémoires de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, vii.^e Série, vol. xxiv. 1876, No. 1). The fact of the forgery was subsequently acknowledged to at least a limited extent by Chwolsen himself (in his *Corpus Inscriptionum Hebraicarum*, Petersburg 1882). Comp. also Kautzsch in the *Theol. Litztg.* 1883, p. 319 sqq.

²³ Comp. Cless, *De coloniis Judaeorum in Aegyptum terrasque cum Aegypti*

Jewish immigrants were already found there. Psammetichus I. is said to have had Jewish mercenaries in his army in his war against the Ethiopians, 650 B.C.²⁴ In the time of Jeremiah a large train of Jewish emigrants went into Egypt, for fear of the Chaldees and in opposition to the will of the prophet (Jer. xlii., xliii.; for the occasion, see Jer. xli.). They settled in various parts of Egypt, in Migdol, Tahpanhes, Noph and Pathros (Jer. xliv.);²⁵ and though many of them embraced the religion of Egypt and many were extirpated by war, still a remnant was left. A forcible deportation of Jewish colonists to Egypt is said to have taken place in the time of the Persian supremacy.²⁶ Their most flourishing period however does not begin till the time of Alexander the Great. As early as the foundation of Alexandria, Jewish settlers were attracted

conjunctas post Mosen deductis, P. I., Stuttg. 1832. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* art. "Alexandrien." See other literature in Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments*, § 430.

²⁴ Aristeae, *epist.* ed. M. Schmidt, in Merx' *Archiv für wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. T.* vol. i. p. 255 (Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 104), enumerates the three following chief emigrations of Jews to Egypt, from Ptolemy I. backwards: 'Εκεῖνος γὰρ (i.e. Ptolemy Lagos) ἐπελθὼν τὰ κατὰ κοίλην Συρίαν καὶ Φοινίκην ἅπαντα, συγχράμενος εὐημερίᾳ μετ' ἀνδρείας, τοὺς μὲν μετῴκιζεν, οὓς δὲ ἡχμαλώτιζε, φόβῳ πανθ' ὑποχείρια ποιούμενος· ἐν ὧσ' καὶ πρὸς δέκα μυριάδας ἐκ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων χώρας εἰς Αἴγυπτον μετέγαγεν· ἀφ' ὧν ὥσεί τρεῖς μυριάδας καθοπλίσας ἀνδρῶν ἐκλεκτῶν εἰς τὴν χώραν κατῴκισεν ἐν τοῖς Φρουρίοις· ἥδη μὲν καὶ πρότερον ἱκανῶν εἰσεληλυθότων σὺν τῷ Πέρσῃ, καὶ πρὸ τούτων ἑτέρων συμμαχιῶν ἐξαπεσταλμένοι πρὸς τὸν τῶν Αἰθιοπῶν βασιλεῦς μάχεσθαι σὺν Ψαμμητιχῷ· ἀλλ' οὐ τοσοῦτοι τῷ πλήθει παρεγενήθησαν, ὅσους Πτολεμαῖος ὁ τοῦ Λάγου μετέγαγε. That Psammetichus had foreign mercenaries in his army is evidenced elsewhere also; see Cless, *De coloniis*, pp. 4-7, and Pauly's *Real-Enc.* vi. 1. 167 sq.

²⁵ דַּפְנֵה and דַּפְנֵה (= Daphne) are situate in the neighbourhood of Pelusium, i.e. on the north-eastern boundary of Lower Egypt. דַּן or דָּן is Memphis on the southern extremity of the Delta. דִּשְׁ is Upper Egypt. See the commentaries and the articles on this matter in Gesenius' *Thesaurus* and Winer's *Realwörterb.*

²⁶ Aristeas speaks of such a one in two passages; see one in note 24, above; the other, ed. Schmidt, p. 260, Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 107. Comp. also Cless, *De coloniis*, pp. 11-13.

to it by the bestowal upon them of the rights of citizenship.²⁷ Large numbers of Jews afterwards came to Egypt chiefly under Ptolemy I. Lagos, some as prisoners of war and some as voluntary immigrants. They were employed by Ptolemy as mercenaries, especially for garrisoning fortified places.²⁸ In Alexandria a special quarter apart from the rest of the city was, in the times of the Diadochoi, assigned to the Jews, "that they might lead a purer life by mingling less with foreigners."²⁹ This Jewish quarter lay on the harbourless coast, in the neighbourhood of the royal palace, and therefore in the north-eastern part of the town.³⁰ This severance was not afterwards strictly maintained. For according to Philo there were Jewish houses of prayer in all parts of the city,³¹ and many Jews dwelt

²⁷ *Apion*. ii. 4. *Antt.* xix. 5. 2.

²⁸ Hecateus in Joseph. *Apion*. i. 22 (Bekker, p. 203, lin. 31 sq.): οὐκ ὀλίγαι δὲ [μυριάδες] καὶ μετὰ τὸν Ἀλεξάνδρου θάνατον εἰς Αἴγυπτον καὶ Φοινίκην μετέστησαν διὰ τὴν ἐν Συρίᾳ στάσιν. Further particulars in the passage quoted note 24 from Aristes, and Josephus, *Antt.* xii. 1.

²⁹ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 7: (οἱ διάδοχοι) τόπον ἴδιον αὐτοῖς ἀφώρισαν, ὅπως καθαρωτέραν ἔχοιεν τὴν διαίταν, ἥττον ἐπιμισγομένων τῶν ἀλλοφύλων. Strabo in Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2: χωρὶς δὲ τῆς τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων πόλεως ἀφώριστο μέγα μέρος τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ. According to Joseph. *Apion*. ii. 4, it might appear as though Alexander the Great had assigned this special quarter to the Jews. But, according to the evidently more accurate statement in *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 7, this was first done by the Diadochoi. Comp. J. G. Müller, *Des Flavii Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion* (1877), p. 239.

³⁰ Josephus, c. *Apion*. ii. 4, *init.* (cited from *Apion*): ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ Συρίας ἤκησαν πρὸς ἀλίμενον θάλασσαν, γειτνιάσαντες ταῖς τῶν κυμάτων ἐκβολαῖς. . . . (Josephus himself also says): πρὸς τοῖς βασιλείοις ἦσαν ἰδρυμένοι. The great harbour of Alexandria, along which lay the greater part of the town, is bounded on the west by the island of Pharos and the mole connecting the island with the continent, on the east by the promontory of Lochias, which juts out from the mainland into the sea (see especially the plan in Kiepert, *Zur Topographie des alten Alexandria*, Berlin 1872; also M. Erdmann, *Zur Kunde der hellenistischen Städtegründungen*, *Strassburger Progr.* 1883, pp. 10–23). On the promontory of Lochias and in its neighbourhood lay the royal citadel, with the numerous buildings appertaining to it (Strabo, xvii. 1. 9, p. 794), which together made up a fifth of the town (Plinius, v. 10. 62; see in general Pauly's *Real-Enc.* i. 1. 739 sq.). Hence the Jewish quarter lay on the coast east of the promontory of Lochias.

³¹ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 20, Mang. ii. 565.

scattered through all its quarters.³² But even Philo says also, that of the five districts of the town, which were named after the first five letters of the alphabet, two were called "the Jewish," because they were chiefly inhabited by Jews.³³ The separation was however on the whole maintained, and we shall find the Jewish quarter still in the same place, viz. in the east of the town, in Philo's time.³⁴ According to an incidental notice in Josephus, the Jews dwelt chiefly in the "so-called Delta," i.e. in the fourth district of the town.³⁵ Philo estimates the entire number of the Jewish inhabitants of Egypt at about a million in his days.³⁶ The Jews of Alexandria and Egypt took, in conformity with their large numbers and importance, a prominent part in all the chief conflicts between the Jewish and the heathen world, in the great persecution under Caligula (see § 17c) and in the insurrections in the times of Nero, Vespasian³⁷

³² Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 8, Mang. ii. 525. See the next note.

³³ Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 8, Mang. ii. 525: Πέντε μοῖραι τῆς πόλεως εἰσιν, ἐπώνυμοι τῶν πρώτων στοιχείων τῆς ἐγγραμμάτου Φωνῆς· τούτων δύο Ἰουδαϊκαὶ λέγονται, διὰ τὸ πλείστους Ἰουδαίους ἐν ταύταις κατοικεῖν. Οἰκοῦσι δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις οὐκ ὀλίγοι σποράδες. The division of Alexandria into five districts and their appellation after the first five letters of the alphabet is also testified elsewhere. See Pseudo-Callisthenes, i. 32 (ed. Meusel in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbh. für class. Philol. Supplemental*, vol. v.): Θεμελιώσας δὲ τὸ πλείστον μέρος τῆς πόλεως Ἀλέξανδρος, καὶ χωρογραφήσας ἐπέγραψε γράμματα πέντε· α β γ δ ε. The second of these districts is mentioned in an inscription of the time of Antoninus Pius: Τιβέριος Ἰούλιος Ἀλέξανδρος τῶν ἀγορανομηκότων ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς εὐθηνίας τοῦ Β γράμματος (see Lumbroso in the *Annali dell' Istituto di corrisp. archeol.* 1875, p. 15; Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, f. 1874-75, vol. ii. p. 305; Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. 1881, p. 455).

³⁴ Josephus expressly says, *c. Apion.* ii. 4, that the Jews did not subsequently relinquish the place occupied by them (κατέσχον μὴδ' ὕστερον ἐκπεσεῖν).

³⁵ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 8: εἰς τὸ καλούμενον Δέλτα· συνήκιστο γὰρ ἐκεί τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν.

³⁶ Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 6, Mang. ii. 523: οὐκ ἀποδέουσι μυριάδων ἑκατὸν οἱ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν καὶ τὴν χώραν Ἰουδαῖοι κατοικοῦντες ἀπὸ τοῦ πρὸς Λιβύην καταβαθμοῦ μέχρι τῶν ὄριων Αἰθιοπίας.

³⁷ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 7-8, vii. 10.

and Trajan (see § 21).³⁸ The very history of these conflicts is at the same time a proof of the continued importance of the Egyptian Jews in the Roman period also. But besides the Jews properly so called, there were also Samaritans dwelling in Egypt. Ptolemy I. Lagos, when he conquered Palestine, carried away with him many captives, not only from Judaea and Jerusalem, but also "from Samaria and Mount Gerizim," and settled them in Egypt.³⁹ In the time of Ptolemy VI. Philometor the Jews and Samaritans are said to have brought their dispute, as to whether Jerusalem or Gerizim was the true place of worship, before the tribunal of the king.⁴⁰ Hadrian in his letter to Servianus says of the Samaritans in Egypt as well as of the Jews and Christians dwelling there, that they were all of them "astrologers, haruspices and quacks."⁴¹ In a work of one Bishop Eulogius we are told of a synod held by him against the Samaritans. If we are to understand, that he is Eulogius of Alexandria, elsewhere spoken of, the flourishing condition of the Samaritans in Egypt during the sixth century after Christ would be proved.⁴²

The Jewish Dispersion penetrated from Egypt farther westward. It was very numerous represented in Cyrenaica.

³⁸ Comp. on the Alexandrian persecutions of the Jews, the Rabbinical passages cited by Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 99, s.v. רבבסנרררר.

³⁹ Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 1: πολλοὺς αἰχμαλώτους λαβὼν ἀπὸ τε τῆς ὀρεινῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ τῶν περὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα τόπων καὶ τῆς Σαμαρείτιδος καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ ὄρει τῇ Γαριζίν, κατέκτισεν ἅπαντας εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀγαγών.

⁴⁰ *Antt.* xiii. 3. 4. Comp. xii. 1, *fin.*

⁴¹ *Vopisc. vita Saturnini*, c. 8 (in the *Scriptores historiae Augustae*): nemo illic archisynagogus Judaeorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum presbyter non mathematicus, non haruspex, non aliptes.

⁴² We know the work of this Eulogius only from the information given in Photius, *Biblioth. cod.* 230, s. *fin.* (ed. Bekker, p. 285). Photius esteemed the author to be Eulogius of Alexandria (at the end of the 6th century), which however is not consistent with the fact, that the synod is said to have been held in the seventh year of the Emperor Marcianus (450-457). The only alternative is either to alter Marcianus into Mauricius, who reigned from A.D. 582 to 602 (as e.g. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. gr.* x. 754), or to think of some other Eulogius, perhaps the bishop of Philadelphia, in

Ptolemy I. Lagos had already sent Jewish settlers thither.⁴³ According to Strabo, the inhabitants of the city of Cyrene were in Sulla's time (about 85 B.C.) divided into four classes: 1. citizens, 2. agriculturists, 3. metoikoi, 4. Jews.⁴⁴ At that time the Jews were already playing a prominent part in the disturbances in Cyrene, which Lucullus had to allay during his accidental presence there.⁴⁵ The Jews at Cyrene seem to have been at all times quite specially disposed to insurrection. In the time of Vespasian the after-piece of the war was played out here,⁴⁶ and in the time of Trajan Cyrenaica was a main seat of the great Jewish revolt (see above, § 21).⁴⁷ We may also safely assume, that Jewish settlements likewise existed still farther westward. Only single traces of such are however to be discovered with any certainty.⁴⁸

Palestine, who signed the acts of the Council of Chalcedon 451 (as e.g. Tillemont and Ceillier; see in general, Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, s.v. Eulogius). In the latter case his work would be taken no account of in the history of the *Egyptian Samaritans*.

⁴³ Joseph. *Apion*. ii. 4. Comp. on the history of Cyrenaica, Thrice, *Res Cyrenensium*, Hafniae 1828. Clinton, *Fasti Helleneci*, iii. 394–398. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. (1881) pp. 457–464, and the literature there cited. On the geography, Forbiger, *Handb. der alten Geographie*, ii. 825–832.

⁴⁴ Strabo in Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2: τέτταρες δ' ἦσαν ἐν τῇ πόλει τῶν Κυρηναίων, ἡ τε τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ ἡ τῶν γεωργῶν, τρίτη δ' ἡ τῶν μετοίκων καὶ τετάρτη ἡ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

⁴⁵ Strabo in Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2. On the doings of Lucullus in Cyrene, see Plutarch. *Lucull.* 2. Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, i. 459. His main object was to requisition ships for Sulla. But he had also internal disturbances to compose, the condition of Cyrene, which was not organized as a province till 74 B.C., being still very disordered.

⁴⁶ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 11; *Vita*, 76.

⁴⁷ Comp. on the history of the Jews in Cyrene, 1 Macc. xv. 23 (also above, p. 221); *Antt.* xvi. 6. 1, 5; and the inscription of Berenike, *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 5361. Jews of Cyrene are mentioned 2 Macc. ii. 23 (Jason of Cyrene), Matt. xxvii. 32=Mark xv. 21=Luke xxiii. 26 (Simon of Cyrene); Acts ii. 10 (Cyrenians at the feast of Pentecost at Jerusalem); Acts vi. 9 (synagogue of the Cyrenians in Jerusalem); Acts xi. 20 (Cyrenians come from Jerusalem to Antioch); Acts xiii. 1 (Lucius of Cyrene at Antioch).

⁴⁸ A Jewish inscription Pompejo Restuto Judeo at Citra, in Leon Renier,

The diffusion of the Jews in Greece is already evident from the history of the Apostle Paul, who found Jewish synagogues in Thessalonica, Beroea, Athens and Corinth (Acts xvii. 1, 10, 17, xviii. 4, 7). This is confirmed by the expressions of Agrippa in the above-mentioned epistle to Caligula.⁴⁹ There were also Jews in almost all the islands of the Grecian Archipelago and the Mediterranean Sea, and in some of these in large numbers. In the epistle Euböa, Cyprus and Crete are decidedly mentioned.⁵⁰ And if we only know this expressly in a smaller measure of the smaller islands, the reason lies in the scantiness of our sources of information.⁵¹

In *Italy* Rome was the seat of a Jewish community numbered by thousands.⁵² The first appearance of Jews in *Inscriptions de l'Algérie* (Paris 1855), n. 2072 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. viii. n. 7155. A pater sinagogae upon an inscription at Sitifis in Mauritania in Orelli-Henzen, *Inscr. Lat.* vol. iii. n. 6145 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. viii. n. 8499. That there were Jews in Carthage in Tertullian's time appears from the commencement of his work, *adv. Judaeos*. Freidländer, *De Judaeorum coloniis* (Königsberg Progr. 1876), refers to a passage of Procopius (*De aedif.* vi. 2, ed. Dindorf, iii. 334).

⁴⁹ Comp. also *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. iv. n. 9900 (a Jewish inscription at Athens), n. 9896 (at Patras in Achaia).

⁵⁰ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 36, Mang. ii. 587. Comp. on Cyprus, Acts xiii. 4 sqq. Joseph. *Antt.* 10. 4, and the history of the great insurrection under Trajan (§ 21, above); on Crete, Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 12. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 7. 1; *Vita*, 76.

⁵¹ Comp. 1 Macc. xv. 23 (on this see above, p. 221. Delos, Samos, Cos and Rhodes are named). *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9894 (a Jewish inscription at Algina); Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 12. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 7. 1 (Melos); *Antt.* xiv. 10. 8 (Paros); *Antt.* xiv. 10. 8 and 14 (Delos); *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2 and 10. 15 (Cos).

⁵² Comp. on the Jews in Rome, Migliore, *Ad inscriptionem Flaviae Antoninae commentarius sive de antiquis Judaeis Italicis exercitatio epigraphica* (MS. of the Vatican library, n. 9143, cited by Engeström). Auer, *Die Juden in Rom unmittelbar vor und nach Christi Geburt* (*Zeitschr. für die gesammte kathol. Theol.* vol. iv. No. 1, 1852, pp. 56–105). Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.*, 2nd ed. iii. 383–392 (1st ed. iii. 71–81). Renan, *Paulus*, p. 131 sqq. Engeström, *Om Judarne i Rom under äldre tider och deras katakomber*, Upsala 1876. Huidekoper, *Judaism at Rome*, New York 1876. Schürer, *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom in der Kaiserzeit*, Leipzig 1879. Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii

Rome dates from the time of the Maccabees. Judas Maccabaeus sent an embassy to the Senate to conclude an alliance with Rome, or, to speak more correctly, to obtain an assurance of its friendship and assistance (1 Macc. viii. 17-32). His brother and successor Jonathan followed his example (1 Macc. xii. 1-4, xvi.). Of greater importance was the embassy, which Simon the third of the Maccabean brothers sent to Rome in the year 140-139 B.C. It effected an actual offensive and defensive alliance with the Romans (1 Macc. xiv. 24, xv. 15-24). During their prolonged sojourn at Rome the envoys or their retinue seem also to have attempted a religious propaganda. For it is this that is alluded to in the certainly somewhat confused notice in Valerius Maximus, i. 3. 2: Idem (viz. the praetor Hispalus) Judaeos, qui Sabazi Jovis cultu Romanos inficere mores conati erant, repetere domos suas coegit).⁵³ Jupiter Zabazius is indeed a Phrygian deity.⁵⁴ Since however *Judaeos* is certified

pp. 1033-1037 (art. "Rom"). Hild, *Les juifs à Rome devant l'opinion et dans la littérature* (*Revue des études juives*, vol. viii. 1884, pp. 1-37, and continuation). Hudson, *History of the Jews in Rome*, 2nd ed. London. 1884 (394 pp.). The works and articles of Lévy, Garrucci and others on the inscriptions of the Jewish catacombs in Rome (see above, § 2).

⁵³ There is a large hiatus in the first book of the text of Valerius Maximus. Two extracts from his works, which have been preserved to us, that of Julius Paris and that of Januarius Nepotianus (both given by Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, iii. 3, 1828) help to fill it up. (For the hiatus, see also Kempt's edition of Valerius Maximus, 1854.) The passage with which we are concerned is given above, according to the extract of Paris. In the extract of Nepotianus this same passage runs as follows: Judaeos quoque, qui Romanis tradere sacra sua conati erant, idem Hippalus urbe exterminavit; arasque privatas ■ publicis locis abiecit. Since then both summarizers have the word *Judaeos*, it must without doubt have existed in Valerius Maximus. It is wanting only in the printed common text derived from a bad transcript from Paris, which I followed in the first edition of this book.

⁵⁴ Comp. on Sabazius, Georgii in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* vii. 1, 615-621. Lenormant in the *Revue archéologique*, new series, vol. xxviii. 1874, pp. 300 sqq., 380 sqq., xxix. 1875, p. 43 sqq. On his worship in Rome, Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 1878, p. 80 sq.; *Corp. Inscr.*

by the text, his appellation in our passage undoubtedly rests upon a confusion of the Jewish *Sabaoth* (*Zebaoth*) with *Sabazius*.⁵⁵ The event here related happened however (according to the immediately preceding words in Valerius Maximus) during the consulate of Popilius Laenas and L. Calpurnius Piso (B.C. 139), *i.e.* exactly at the time of Simon's embassy, to which it is most probably to be referred. It may also be inferred from it, that no Jews then dwelt permanently in Rome. The settlement there of a great number of Jews dates only from the time of Pompey. After his conquest of Jerusalem in the year 63 B.C., he brought numerous Jewish prisoners of war with him to Rome. They were then sold as slaves; but many of them were soon set at liberty, their strict adherence to their Jewish customs being inconvenient to their masters. Endowed with the privileges of Roman citizenship, they settled beyond the Tiber and formed an independent Jewish community.⁵⁶ From that time onwards the Jewish

Lat. vol. vi. n. 429, 430. Cicero already knows of the Sabazia (*De natura deorum*, iii. 23. 58).

⁵⁵ Zebaoth is indeed not a proper name. The Hebrew Jahveh Zebaoth having however been rendered by κύριος Σαβαώθ (by the LXX. especially in Isaiah, see Trommius' *Concordance*, the form Σαβαώθ being better evidenced than Σαββαώθ), Σαβαώθ has in fact been treated as a name of God by Jews, Christians and heathen, see *Orac. Sibyll.* i. 304, 316, ii. 240, xii. 132 (ed. Friedlieb, x. 132). Celsus in Origen, *c. Cels.* i. 24, v. 41, 45. The Gnostics in Irenaeus, i. 30. 5; Origen, *c. Cels.* vi. 31, 32; Epiphanius, *haer.* xxvi. 10, xl. 2. Many Gnostics (see Baudissin, *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, No. 1, 1876, p. 187 sqq.); Origen himself, *Exhortatio ad martyrium*, c. 46; Hieronymus, *epist. 25 ad Marcellam de decem nominibus Dei* (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, i. 130). Also in similar anonymous treatises on the names of God (*Hieronimi Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, iii. 749 sq. Legarde, *Onomastica sacra*, pp. 160, 205 sq.). The Hebrew Sabbath is certainly out of the question, as it is not possible to see how that could be understood as the name of the Deity.

⁵⁶ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23, Mang. ii. 568: Πῶς οὖν ἀπεδέχετο (*scil.* Augustus) τὴν πέραν τοῦ Τιβέρεως ποταμοῦ μεγάλην τῆς Ῥώμης ἀποτομὴν, ἣν οὐκ ἠγνόει κατεχομένην καὶ οἰκουμένην πρὸς Ἰουδαίων; Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ ἦσαν οἱ πλείους ἀπελευθερωθέντες. Αἰχμάλωτοι γὰρ ἀρχόντες εἰς Ἱταλίαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπισταμένων ἡλευθερώθησαν, οὐδὲν τῶν πατρίων παραχαράξαι βιασθέντες.

colony in Trastevere formed no unimportant factor in Roman life. When Cicero, in the year 59 B.C., made his oration in defence of Flaccus, we find many Jews present among the auditors.⁵⁷ At the death of Caesar, the great protector of the Jews, a multitude of the latter made lamentation at his bier during whole nights.⁵⁸ In the time of Augustus they were already numbered by thousands. Josephus at least tells us that 8000 Roman Jews joined the deputation which came from Palestine to Rome in the year 4 B.C.⁵⁹ In the time of Tiberius repressive measures commenced. According to Josephus, the whole Jewish population was banished from Rome A.D. 19, because a few Jews had swindled a noble female proselyte named Fulvia of large sums of money under the pretext of sending them to the temple at Jerusalem.⁶⁰ Four thousand Jews capable of bearing arms were on this account deported to Sardinia to fight against the brigands in that island; the rest were banished from the city. Such are the accounts of Tacitus,⁶¹ Suetonius,⁶² and Josephus,⁶³ whose statements

⁵⁷ Cicero, *pro Flacco*, 28.

⁵⁸ Sueton. *Caesar*, 84: In summo publico luctu exterarum gentium multitudo circulatim suo quaeque more lamentata est, praecipueque Judaei, qui etiam noctibus continuis bustum frequentarunt.

⁵⁹ *Antt.* xvii. 11. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 1.

⁶⁰ *Antt.* xviii. 3. 5.

⁶¹ *Annal.* ii. 85: Actum et de sacris Aegyptiis Judaicisque pellendis factumque patrum consultum, ut quattuor milia libertini generis ea superstitione infecta, quis idonea aetas, in insulam Sardiniam veherentur, coercendis illic latrociniiis et, si ob gravitatem caeli interissent, vile damnum; ceteri cederent Italia, nisi certam ante diem profanos ritus exuissent.

⁶² *Vita Tiber.* 36: Externas caerimonias, Aegyptios Judaicosque ritus compescuit, coactis qui superstitione ea tenebantur religiosas vestes cum instrumento omni comburere. Judaeorum juventutem per speciem sacramenti in provincias gravioris caeli distribuit, reliquos gentis ejusdem vel similia sectantes urbe summovit, sub poena perpetuae servitutis nisi obtemperassent.

⁶³ Josephus (*Antt.* xviii. 3. 5) says expressly, that 4000 Jews were chosen for military service and sent to Sardinia. Tacitus gives the same number, but speaks of Egyptians and Jews. According to Tacitus, the rest

essentially agree. According to the contemporary narrative of Philo, these measures were chiefly carried out by the then powerful Sejanus.⁶⁴ After his overthrow, A.D. 31, Tiberius perceived that the Jews had been slandered without cause by Sejanus, and commanded the authorities (*ὑπάρχους*) in all places not to molest the Jews, nor to prevent the practice of their customs.⁶⁵ It may here be assumed that a return to Rome was also allowed them; and this explains the fact that Philo should, so early as the time of Caligula, again take for granted the existence of the Jewish community. The reign of Claudius began with a general Edict of Toleration in favour of the Jews.⁶⁶ But this emperor also subsequently found himself obliged to take measures against them. According to the short accounts in the Acts and Suetonius, an actual expulsion of the Jews took place under Claudius.⁶⁷ According however to the evidently more accurate account of Dio Cassius, had been expelled from Italy; according to Josephus, only from Rome. Suetonius agrees more with Josephus. On the chronology, comp. Volkmar, *Die Religionsverfolgung unter Kaiser Tiberius und die Chronologie des Fl. Josephus in der Pilatus-Periode* (*Jahrbb. für prot. Theol.* 1885, pp. 136-143). Volkmar correctly concludes, that Josephus (*Antt.* xviii. 3. 5) means the same expulsion of Jews as Tacitus, and that it took place (according to the narrative of Tacitus) A.D. 19.

⁶⁴ Euseb. *Chron. ad ann. Abr.* 2050 (ed. Schoene, ii. 150), from the Armenian: Seianus Tiberii procurator, qui intimus erat consiliarius regis, universim gentem Judaeorum deperdendam exposcebat. Meminit autem huius Philon in secunda relatione. Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 621: *Σηιανὸς ἑπαρχὸς Τιβερίου Καίσαρος περὶ τελείας ἀπωλείας τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων πολλὰ σὺν ἐβούλευε τῷ Καίσαρι, ὡς Φίλων Ἰουδαῖος ἐξ Ἀλεξανδρείας διάγων ἱστορεῖ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῆς περὶ αὐτοῦ πρεσβείας.* Hieronymus, *Chron.* (in Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene, ii. 151): Seianus praefectus Tiberii qui apud eum plurimum poterat instantissime cohortatur, ut gentem Judaeorum debeat. Filo meminit in libro legationis secundo. The same information, according to the same work of Philo, is also found in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 5. 7. Comp. on this work of Philo, § 34, below.

⁶⁵ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 24, ed. Mang. ii. 569.

⁶⁶ Joseph. *Antt.* xix. 5. 2, 3.

⁶⁷ Acts xviii. 2: *διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης.* Sueton. *Claud.* 25: *Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.*

Claudius only prohibited the assemblies of the Jews, because their expulsion could not be carried out without great tumult.⁶⁸ This prohibition was indeed equal to a prohibition of the free exercise of their religion, and would certainly have the result of inducing many to leave the city. Its date cannot be accurately determined; it was probably promulgated in the later times of Claudius.⁶⁹ From the words of Suetonius it

⁶⁸ Dio Cass. lx. 6: τοὺς τε Ἰουδαίους πλεονάσαντας αὐτοῖς, ὥστε χαλεπῶς ἂν ἄνευ ταραχῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου σφῶν τῆς πόλεως εἰρχθῆναι, οὐκ ἐξήλασε μὲν, τῷ δὲ δὴ πατρίῳ βίῳ χρωμένους ἐκέλευσε μὴ συναθροίζεσθαι. In Dio Cassius this notice stands at the beginning of the reign of Claudius, while the measure related in the Acts of the Apostles probably took place much later (see note 69). Dio Cassius however is not here giving as yet a chronological narrative, but only describing the general characteristics of Claudius (this to me seems certain notwithstanding the remarks to the contrary of H. Lehmann, *Studien zur Gesch. des apost. Zeitalters*, pp. 2-4, with the words λέξω δὲ καθ' ἑκάστου ἃν ἐποίησε, c. 3. Dio passes over not to a chronological narrative, but to a description of the good side of Claudius). It is not credible that an unfavourable edict against the Jews should be carried into effect in the early days of Claudius, who was just then issuing an edict for their toleration. The edict therefore mentioned by Dio Cassius is most probably identical with that of Suetonius. For it would indeed be strange if one should mention the former and the other the latter. The *expulit* of Suetonius must be understood according to the analogy of Suetonius, *Tiber.* 36: *expulit et mathematicos, sed deprecantibus . . . veniam dedit.* The expulsion was indeed contemplated, but when it was perceived that it would encounter difficulties, it was abandoned. This also explains the silence of Tacitus and Josephus.

⁶⁹ The year might be accurately determined if this edict were identical with that mentioned by Tacitus of the year 52. *Tac. Annal.* xii. 52: *De mathematicis Italia pellendis factum senatus consultum atrox et irritum.* But the *mathematici* cannot possibly mean the Jewish community at Rome. In the Chronicle of Eusebius and Jerome the expulsion of the Jews by Claudius is not mentioned. Orosius alone, vii. 6. 15 (ed. Zangemeister, 1882), gives a precise date for this edict: *Anno ejusdem nono expulsos per Claudium Urbe Judaeos Josephus refert.* Since however Josephus makes no mention at all of the matter, the statement is certainly incorrect with respect to authority and therefore probably unreliable with respect to matter. It is moreover probable, from the connection of the Acts of the Apostles (observe the *προσφάτως*, Acts xviii. 2), that the edict was issued about A.D. 50-52. Comp. in general, Anger, *De temporum in actis apostolorum ratione* (1833), p. 116 sqq. Wieseler, *Chronologie des apostol. Zeitalters*, pp. 120-128. Winer, *RWB.* i. 231 sq. (art. "Claudius"). H.

might indeed be inferred, that it was occasioned by the disturbances, which arose within Judaism in consequence of the preaching of Christ.⁷⁰ This edict of Claudius had also but transient consequences. Such measures were not capable of extirpating the firmly rooted Jewish community, or of even permanently weakening it. It was already, chiefly by means of its numerous proselytes, too much intertwined with Roman life for its complete suppression to be successful. The Jews, when expelled from the city, emigrated to the neighbourhood, perhaps to Aricia,⁷¹ soon to return thence to their old abodes. Their history in Rome may be summed up in the words of Dio Cassius: Often suppressed, they nevertheless mightily increased, so that they achieved even the free exercise of their customs.⁷² The aristocratic Roman indeed looked down upon them with contempt. But the numerous lampoons of the satirists are just so many evidences of the notice they attracted in Roman society.⁷³ Even from the time of Augustus direct relations of Jews to the imperial court are not lacking; nay, in the reign of Nero the Empress Poppaea seems herself to have been inclined to Judaism.⁷⁴ By degrees they spread

Lehmann, *Studien zur Geschichte des apostolischen Zeitalters* (1856), pp. 1-9. Lewin, *Fasti Sacri* (London 1865), n. 1773, 1774. Keim, art. "Claudius," in Schenkel's *Bibellex.*

⁷⁰ On Chrestus = Cristus, see Hug, *Einl. in das N. T.* (4th ed.) ii. 335. Credner, *Einl. in das N. T.* p. 381. Hilgenfeld, *Einl. in das N. T.* p. 303 sq. Huidekoper, *Judaism at Rome*, p. 229 sq.

⁷¹ This is intimated by the scholiast on Juvenal, iv. 117: qui ud portam Aricinam sive ad clivum mendicaret inter Judaeos, qui ad Ariciam transierant ex Urbe missi.

⁷² Dio Cass. xxxvii. 17: ἔστι καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Ῥωμαῖοις τὸ γένος τοῦτο, κολουσθέν μὲν πολλάκις, αὐξηθέν δὲ ἐπὶ πλείστον, ὥστε καὶ ἐς παρρησίαν τῆς νομίσεως ἐκνικῆσαι.

⁷³ On the social position of the Jews in Rome, see the literature cited above, note 52, especially Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. iii. 383-392.

⁷⁴ The names *Αὐγουστήσιοι* and *Ἀγριππήσιοι*, borne by two Jewish communities in Rome (see below, No. 2), point to the relations of Jews to Augustus and Agrippa. The Empress Livia had a Jewish female slave of

farther in the city also. The quarter in Trastevere was no longer their only one. We find them subsequently in the Campus Martius, and in the midst of the Roman commercial world in the Subura (see below, No. 2). Juvenal jests at the fact, that the sacred grove of Egeria, before the Porta Capena, was leased to Jews and swarmed with Jewish beggars (*Sat.* iii. 12-16). The settlement of Jews in various quarters of the town, and their continued prosperity down to the later imperial

the name of Akme (Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 5. 7; *Bell. Jud.* i. 32. 6, 33. 7). Upon an inscription of the time of Claudius, a [Cl]audia Aster [Hi]eropolymitana [ca]ptiva, evidently a Jewish female slave of Claudius, is mentioned (Orelli-Henzen, *Inscr. Lat.* n. 5302 = Mommsen, *Inscr. Regni Neap.* n. 6467 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 1971). We find a Jewish comedian Alityrus at the court of Nero (Joseph. *Vita*, 3). Poppaea is herself designated as θεοσεβής, and was always ready to advocate Jewish petitions with the emperor (Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 8. 11; *Vita*, 3). Tacitus, *Annal.* xvi. 6, remarks of her, that after her death she was not burnt according to Roman custom, but embalmed "after the fashion of foreign kings." The Jewish historian Josephus lived in Rome under Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian, honoured and assisted by the kindness of all three emperors (Joseph. *Vita*, 76). In the person of Domitian's cousin Flavius Clemens, not Judaism indeed, but Christianity, which proceeded from Judaism, penetrated even the imperial family (for so are Dio Cass. lxxvii. 14, and Sueton. *Domit.* 15, now universally and correctly understood). Of later date may perhaps be mentioned also the Jewish playfellow (conluser) of Caracalla (Spartian. *Caracalla*, 1; also Görres, *Zeitschr. f. Wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1884, p. 147 sqq.). We must remember too the active relations of Herod and his dynasty with Augustus and his successors. Most of Herod's sons were brought up at Rome. Agrippa I. spent the greater part of his life in Rome, remaining there till his nomination as king; as a boy he was on terms of friendship with Drusus, the son of Tiberius (Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 6. 1), and afterwards with Caligula. The intimate relations of Agrippa II. and Berenice with Vespasian and Titus are well known; and lastly, it is worthy of remark how frequently the Gentile names of emperors are found among Jewish names upon inscriptions. The following occur, and that in tolerably large numbers: Julius, Claudius, Flavius, Aelius, Aurelius, Valerius. Even though these names may frequently refer not to the old families, but to later emperors (Constantine the Great's full name e.g. being C. Flavius Valerius Aurelius Claudius Const.), still they certainly prove a close relation of the Jews to the emperors. Comp. also Harnack's article on the Christians at the imperial court (*Princeton Review*, July 1878, pp. 239-280).

times, are also especially evidenced by Jewish burying-grounds, some of them the discovery of recent times. Of these, the five following are now known:⁷⁵ (1) A somewhat insignificant cemetery before the Porta Portuensis, discovered by Bosio in the year 1602. This was certainly the burial-place of the Jews in Trastevere. The knowledge of the locality was afterwards lost, and all efforts for its re-discovery have hitherto been unsuccessful.⁷⁶ (2) A large cemetery, discovered in the beginning of the sixth decade of this century, on the Via Appia in the Vigna Randanini (somewhat farther out than the catacomb of Callistus). To it we owe our acquaintance with a large number of Romano-Jewish inscriptions.⁷⁷ (3) In the year 1867 (or 1866) a Jewish cemetery, of which de Rossi gives a short account, was discovered in the vineyard of Count Cimarra, also on the Via Appia, nearly opposite the catacomb of Callistus.⁷⁸ (4) A Jewish cemetery on the Via Labicana, therefore in the neighbourhood of the Esquinal and Viminal, of perhaps the date of the Antonines, was pointed out by Marucchi in the year 1883.^{78a} (5) There was also in Porto (at the mouth of the Tiber) a Jewish cemetery, from which are derived many of the Jewish epitaphs with which we have for a long time been acquainted.⁷⁹ The antiquity of this cemetery, and of the inscriptions contained in it, can only be

⁷⁵ Comp. the summary in Kraus, *Roma Sotterranea* (1st. ed. 1873), p. 489 sq.; and in Caspari, *Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols*, iii. 1875. p. 271 sq.

⁷⁶ Garrucci, *Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei*, p. 3.

⁷⁷ Comp. Garrucci, *Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei scoperto recentemente in Vigna Randanini*, Rome 1862. The same, *Dissertazioni archeologiche di vario argomento*, vol. ii. Roma 1865, pp. 150–192. On the situation of the cemetery, see the plan in De Rossi, *Bullettino di Archeologia cristiana* (1st series), vol. v. 1867, p. 3, and the explanation, p. 16.

⁷⁸ De Rossi, *Bullettino*, v. 16.

^{78a} Marucchi in de Rossi's *Bullettino*, 1883, p. 79 sq.

⁷⁹ See de Rossi, *Bullettino*, iv. 1866, p. 40. The inscriptions known down to the year 1850 are collected in *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. iv, a. 9901–9926. Comp. the literature on the inscriptions, § 2, above.

approximately determined. They may date chiefly from the second to the fourth centuries after Christ.

Besides Jews properly so called, there were in Rome (as in Alexandria) Samaritans also. A Samaritan of the name of Thallus, a freedman of the Emperor Tiberius, once lent a large sum to Agrippa I. in Rome.⁸⁰ The existence of a Samaritan community in Rome, in the time of the Ostrogoth king Theodoric, is evidenced by a letter of this king to the knight Arigernus, which is embodied in the collection of letters of Cassiodorus.⁸¹ That the Samaritans were by no means without importance in the Roman Empire in later imperial times, is shown by the frequent reference to them in imperial legislation.⁸²

After the Jewish community in Rome, that of Puteoli (Dikäarchia) is presumably the most ancient in Italy. In this chief trading port of Italy with the East, we find Jews so early as B.C. 4, immediately after the death of Herod the Great.⁸³ Their presence cannot be pointed out in other parts of Italy till later imperial times; this does not however permit any negative inference as to the date of their settlement.⁸⁴ Much material in the way of inscriptions has recently

⁸⁰ Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 6. 4.

⁸¹ Cassiodor. *Variarum*, iii. 45 (*Opp.* ed. Garetius): Arigerno Viro Illustri Comiti Theodoricus Rex . . . Defensores itaque sacrosanctae Romanae ecclesiae conquesti sunt, beatae recordationis quondam Simplicium domum in sacratissima Urbe positam ab Eufrazio Acolyto instrumentis factis solemniter comparasse; quam per annorum longa curricula ecclesiam Romanam quieto jure suggerunt possedissee et in usus alienos transtulisse securitate dominii. Nunc autem existere Samareae superstitionis populum improba fronte duratum, qui Synagogam ibidem fuisse iniquis conatibus mentiatur.

⁸² *Codex Theodosianus* (ed. Haenel), xiii. 5. 18, xvi. 8. 16, u. 28. *Novell. Justin.* 129, u. 144.

⁸³ Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 12. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 7. 1. There was also a Christian church here so early as A.D. 61 (*Acts* xxviii. 13, 14).

⁸⁴ See the information in Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, vol. iii. (1871) pp. 511, 512. The same, *De Judaeorum*

been furnished especially by the discovery of the catacomb of *Venosa* (Venusia in Apulia, the birthplace of Horace). Its inscriptions in Greek, Latin and Hebrew are, according to Mommsen's judgment, of the sixth century after Christ.⁸⁵ We likewise meet with Jewish communities in various parts of Gaul and Spain in later imperial times. In respect of dates, what has been said with regard to Italy holds good here also.⁸⁶

coloniis (Königsberg *Progr.* 1876), pp. 1, 2. Renan, *L'Antichrist* (1873), p. 8. For Lower Italy, also Ascoli, *Iscrizioni* (1880), pp. 33-38. The places in which they are found are especially the following: Genoa (Cassiodor. *Variar.* ii. 27), Milan (Cassiodor. *Variar.* v. 37), Brescia (inscription, *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. v. n. 4411), Aquileia (Roman inscription in Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 62), Bologna (Ambrosius, *Exhortatio virginitatis*, c. 1), Ravenna (*Anonymus Valesii*, cc. 81-82, in the appendix to most editions of Ammianus Marcellinus), Capua (inscription in Mommsen, *Inscr. Regni Neap.* 3657 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 3905), Naples (*Procop. Bell. Gotth.* i. 8 and 10, ed. Dindorf, vol. ii. pp. 44 and 53), Venosa (see next note), Syracuse (inscription, *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9895), Palermo, Messina, Agrigentum (*Letters of Gregory the Great*). In Apulia and Calabria the official posts of the different communities could not be regularly filled up, because the Jewish inhabitants refused to undertake them (edict of the Emperors Honorius and Arcadius of the year 398 in the *Codex Theodosianus*, xii. 1. 158: *Vacillare per Apuliam Calabriamque plurimos ordines civitatum comperimus, quia Judaicae superstitionis sunt, et quadam se lege, quae in Orientis partibus lata est, necessitate subeundorum muerum aestimant defendendos*).

⁸⁵ The catacomb was discovered as early as 1853, and described in two memoirs (by De Angelis and Smith and by D'Aloe). The MSS. of both memoirs however lay buried in the archives of the museum at Naples, till their contents were recently made known (1) in Ascoli's *Iscrizioni inedite o mal note greche latine ebraiche di antichi sepolchri giudaici del Napolitano*, Torino e Roma, 1880, and (2) in *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. (1883), n. 6195-6214, comp. 647, 648. Hirschfeld had already given a short notice on the catacomb (*Bullettino dell' Istituto di corrisp. archeol.* 1867, pp. 148-152). Comp. also *Theol. Literaturztg.* 1880, pp. 485-488. Grätz, *Monatsschr.* 1880, p. 433 sqq. Lenormant, *La catacombe juive de Venosa* (*Revue des études juives*, vol. vi. n. 12, 1883, pp. 200-207). Besides the inscriptions in the catacomb, dated Hebrew epitaphs of Venosa of the ninth century are also known. See Ascoli's above-named work; *Theol. Litztg.* 1880, p. 485.

⁸⁶ See the information in Friedländer's above-named work. With respect to Spain, we mention only the inscription *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ii. n. 1982.

II. CONSTITUTION OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITIES.

1. *Their Internal Organization.*^{86a}

There was of course but one way by which those of the Jewish people that were scattered over the whole earth could possibly maintain their native religion and usages, and that was by organizing themselves into *independent communities*, within which they might cherish the faith and practise the observances of their fathers in a foreign land and in the heart of the Gentile world, just as though they were living in the Holy Land itself. And that this is what, as a rule, they were in the habit of doing, and that from an early period, at all events from the commencement of the Hellenistic era, it is impossible to doubt. The nature of the organization may have varied according to time and place, and above all in so far as those communities had sometimes the character of purely private associations, while at others they were to a greater or less extent in the enjoyment of political privileges; but, be this as it may, it is certain that wherever any considerable number of Jews happened to be living together, there an independent organization was always to be met with as well.

It is with regard to the *eastern diaspora* that our information on this point is most scanty; nay, so far as the diaspora dwelling in the countries bordering on the Euphrates is concerned we have none at all, at least none dating farther back than Talmudic times. Nor are matters much better as regards Asia Minor and Syria. The most noteworthy item of information that can be gleaned in connection with these latter is

^{86a} For this comp. Rhenferd, *De arabarcha vel ethnarcha Judaeorum* (Rhenferdii opera philologica, 1722, pp. 584–613; also in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxiv.). Wesseling, *Diatrise de Judaeorum archontibus ad inscriptionem Berenicensem*, Traj. ad Rhen. 1738 (also in Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. xxiv.). Wesseling's dissertation continues to be of value even in the present day.

the incidental reference on one occasion to an ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων in Antioch.⁸⁷

In Alexandria, where the Jews formed a large portion of the entire population, their community enjoyed very extensive political privileges. According to Strabo, they were presided over by an ἐθνάρχης, "who governs the people and administers justice among them, and sees that they fulfil their obligations and obey orders just like the archon of an independent city."⁸⁸ Consequently, although the Jews who lived here enjoyed the rights of citizenship (see No. III. below), they nevertheless formed an independent municipal community within or co-ordinate with the rest of the city, precisely as in the case of Cyrene. This independent position they also succeeded in maintaining in imperial times, and that very much owing to the circumstance that Alexandria, unlike almost all other Hellenistic towns, had no civic council.⁸⁹ The constitution of the Jewish community in Alexandria would seem to have undergone a certain change in the time of Augustus. At least Philo informs us that, *after the death of the γενάρχης*, Augustus instituted a *γερουσία*, to which the direction of Jewish affairs was entrusted.⁹⁰ No doubt this

⁸⁷ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 3. 3. Seeing that ἄρχων is without the article, it should be rendered not "the ἄρχων," but "an ἄρχων," i.e. one of the Jewish authorities.

⁸⁸ Strabo as quoted by Josephus, *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2: καθίσταται δὲ καὶ ἐθνάρχης αὐτῶν, ὃς διοικεῖ τε τὸ ἔθνος καὶ διαιτᾷ κρίσεις καὶ συμβολαίων ἐπιμελεῖται καὶ προσταγμάτων, ὡς ἐν πολιτείᾳ ἄρχων αὐτοτελοῦς.

⁸⁹ Spartian. Severus, chap. xvii. (in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, ed. Peter, 1865). Dio Cass. li. 17. On the constitution of Alexandria generally, comp. Strabo, xvii. p. 797. Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerl. Verfassung des römischen Reichs*, ii. 476 sqq. Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, i. 1881, p. 451 sqq. Lumbroso, *Recherches sur l'économie politique de l'Égypte sous les Lagides* (Turin 1870), p. 212 sqq.

⁹⁰ Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 10, Mang. ii. 527 sq.: τῆς ἡμετέρας γερουσίας, ἣν ὁ σωτὴρ καὶ εὐεργέτης Σεβαστὸς ἐπιμελησομένην τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν εἴλετο μετὰ τὴν τοῦ γενάρχου τελευτὴν διὰ τῶν πρὸς Μάγνον Μάξιμον ἐντολῶν, μέλλοντα πάλιν ἐπ' Αἰγύπτου καὶ τῆς χώρας ἐπιτροπεύειν.

appears to be at variance with the fact that in an edict of Claudius it is stated, that after the death of the ἐθνάρχης Augustus did not forbid the further appointment of ethnarchs.⁹¹ But probably this latter is only a repetition in a less accurate form of the fact mentioned by Philo, all that Claudius meant to say being simply this, that the Jews also continued as before to be governed by their own rulers (ἐθνάρχαι). The more accurate version of the matter is that of Philo, who states that ever since the time of Augustus the *single* ἐθνάρχης had been superseded by a γερουσία, over which a certain number of ἄρχοντες presided. Both the γερουσία and the ἄρχοντες are frequently mentioned by this writer.⁹² These latter are identical with the πρωτεύοντες τῆς γερουσίας that occur in Josephus.⁹³ As bearing on the question of the number of members composing the γερουσία, we may mention the fact that on one occasion Flaccus caused thirty-eight of them to be dragged into the theatre and there scourged.⁹⁴ It is a very common error to identify the Jewish ethnarch with the Egyptian alabarch. The office of this latter was of a purely civil character, but of course it was often held by distinguished Jews (see No. III. below).

That the Jews living in Cyrene in like manner formed a separate political community is evident from the notice of Strabo already referred to, from which we learn that the inhabitants of this town were divided into four classes: (1) citizens; (2) tillers of the ground; (3) settlers; and (4) Jews.⁹⁵

⁹¹ Joseph. *Antt.* xix. 5. 2: τελευτήσαντος τοῦ Ἰουδαίων ἐθνάρχου τὸν Σεβαστὸν μὴ κεκαλυπέναι ἐθνάρχας γίνεσθαι.

⁹² Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 10, Mang. ii. 528: τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς γερουσίας τρεῖς ἄνδρες. *Ibid.*: μεταπεμφαμένῳ πρότερον τοῦς ἡμετέρους ἄρχοντας. *Ibid.* p. 528 sq.: τοὺς ἄρχοντας, τὴν γερουσίαν. *Ibid.* § 14, p. 534: τῶν μὲν ἀρχόντων.

⁹³ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 10. 1.

⁹⁴ Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 10, Mang. ii. 527 sq.

⁹⁵ Strabo as quoted by Josephus, *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2.

But notwithstanding this separate existence the Jews enjoyed equality of civic rights (*ἰσονομία*).⁹⁶

A very important light is thrown upon the constitution of the Jewish communities of the diaspora by a Jewish inscription found in Berenice, a town in Cyrenaica, and, according to Böckh's calculation, dating from the year 13 B.C.⁹⁷ From that inscription we find that the Jews of Berenice formed a distinct *πολίτευμα* by themselves (lin. 17 f., 21 f.) with *nine* (and these of course Jewish) *archons* at its head (lin. 2-8, 21-25).

⁹⁶ Joseph. *Antt.* xvi. 6. 1: τῶν μὲν πρότερον βασιλέων ἰσονομίαν αὐτοῖς παρεσχημένων. Comp. Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, i. 463.

⁹⁷ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. iii. No. 5361:

[*Ε]τους νε Φαῶφ κε, ἐπὶ συλλόγου τῆς σκηνο-
πηγίας, ἐπὶ ἀρχόντων Κλεάνδρου τοῦ
Στρατονίκου, Εὐφράντορος τοῦ Ἀρίστανος,
Σωσιγένορος τοῦ Σωσίππου, Ἀνδρομάχου
τοῦ Ἀνδρομάχου, Μάρκου Λαιλίου Ὀνασί-
ωνος τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου, Φιλωνίδου τοῦ Ἀγή-
μονος, Αὐτοκλέους τοῦ Ζήνωνος, Σωσί-
κου τοῦ Θεοδότου, Ἰωσήπου τοῦ Στράτωνος

- Ἐπεὶ Μάρκος Τίττιος Σέξτου υἱὸς Αἰμιλίου,
10 ἀνὴρ καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός, παραγ[ε]νηθεὶς εἰς
τὴν ἐπαρχίαν ἐπὶ δημοσίων πραγμάτων τὴν
τε προστασίαν αὐτῶν ἐποίησατο Φιλανθρώ-
πως καὶ καλῶς ἔν τε τῇ ἀναστροφῇ ἡσύχιον
ἦθος ἐνδ[ε]ικνύμενος ἀεὶ διατελῶν τυγχάνει,
15 οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐν τούτοις ἀβαρῆ ἑαυτὸν παρέσ-
χεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς κατ' ἰδίαν ἐντυγχάνουσι
τῶν πολιτῶν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ πολιτεύ-
ματος ἡμῶν Ἰουδαίοις καὶ κοινῇ καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν
εὐχρηστον προστασίαν ποιούμενος οὐ δια-
20 λείπει τῆς ἰδίας καλοκαγαθίας ἄξια πράσσαν-
των χάριν ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀρχουσι καὶ τῷ πολιτεύ-
ματι τῶν ἐν Βερενίκῃ Ἰουδαίων ἐπαινεῖσαι τε αὐ-
τὸν καὶ στεφανοῦν ὀνομαστί καθ' ἐκάστην
σύνυδον καὶ νομηνίαν στεφάνῳ ἐλαίῳ καὶ
25 ληνίσκῳ· τοὺς δὲ ἀρχοντας ἀναγράψαι τὸ
ψήφισμα εἰς στήλην λίθου Παρίου καὶ θεῖναι εἰς
τὸν ἐπισημώτατον τόπον τοῦ ἀμφιθεάτρου

Λευκαὶ πᾶσα.

But it is with regard to the constitution of the Jewish communities of Rome and of Italy generally that we are most thoroughly informed, and that owing to the great amount of light thrown on the subject by the large number of Jewish epitaphs that have been found in the cemeteries of Rome and Venosa.⁹⁸ These further show us, among other things, that here the same arrangements continued to subsist for centuries running without any material alteration. For the inscriptions of Venosa, dating from the sixth century after Christ, still present us with substantially the same picture as those of Rome, the oldest of which probably belong to one of the earliest centuries of our era. From the Roman inscriptions we gather, in the first place, that the Jews living in Rome were divided into *a large number of separate and independently organized communities* (συναγωγαί), each having its own synagogue, gerousia, and public officials. Of the existence of anything in the shape of a corporate union of the whole Jews of Rome under *one γερουσία* there is no trace whatever. While therefore the Jews of Alexandria formed a great political corporation, those of Rome had to be contented with the more modest position of separate religious societies. Those various communities called themselves by special names, of which the following are mentioned on the inscriptions: (1) a *συναγωγή Ἀβγουστησίων*; ⁹⁹ (2) a *συναγωγή Ἀγριππησίων*; ¹⁰⁰ (3) a *synagoga Bolumni* (l. *Volumni*).¹⁰¹ These three took their

⁹⁸ For what follows, comp. Schürer, *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom in der Kaiserzeit nach den Inschriften dargestellt*, Leipzig 1879. The texts of the majority of the inscriptions to which reference is made are also reproduced in an appendix to this work.

⁹⁹ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9902 = Fiorelli, *Catalogo del Museo Nazionale di Napoli, Inscrizioni Latine*, n. 1956: γερουσιάρχης συναγωγῆς Ἀβγουστησίων (sic). *Corp. Inscr. Gr.* 9903 = Fiorelli, *Catalogo*, n. 1960: ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν Ἀβγουστησίων. Orelli, *Inscr. Lat.* n. 3222: Marcus Cuyntus Alexus grammateus ego (l. ἐγὼ) τὸν Augustasion mellarcon eccion (l. ἐκ τῶν) Augustesion.

¹⁰⁰ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9907.

¹⁰¹ Orelli, *Inscr. Lat.* n. 2522: mater synagogarum Campi et Bolumni.

names from certain distinguished personages. And seeing that along with *Αὐγουστήσιοι* we also meet with *Ἀγριππήσιοι*, there can hardly be a doubt that the former derived their name from the first Augustus, while the latter derived theirs from his friend and adviser M. Agrippa. The designation may be accounted for either by the fact that Augustus and Agrippa were patrons, the one of the one community and the other of the other, or from the circumstance that those communities were for the most part composed of slaves and freedmen of Augustus on the one hand, or of Agrippa on the other (comp. *οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας*, Phil. iv. 22). Other communities again took their names from the particular quarter of the city in which their members happened to reside, as, for example, (4) the *Καμπήσιοι* from the *Campus Martius*,¹⁰² and (5) the *Σιβουρήσιοι* from the *Subura*, one of the busiest quarters of ancient Rome, and a centre of trade and industry.¹⁰³ Besides these we also hear (6) of a *συναγωγή Αἰβρέων*, probably that of such of the Jews as spoke Hebrew, in contradistinction to those of them who had ceased to speak it,¹⁰⁴ and (7) a *συναγωγή Ἑλαιάς*, so called from the symbol of the olive.¹⁰⁵ Of the *officials* who are mentioned on those inscriptions we would notice above all the *γερουσιάρχης* and the *ἄρχοντες*. (1) A *γερουσιάρχης* occurs not only upon the

¹⁰² *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9905, 9906 (for more accurate texts according to Garrucci, see my work, *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden*, Appendix, Nos. 4 and 5). Orelli, 2522. Garrucci, *Dissertazioni*, ii. 161, n. 10.

¹⁰³ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 6447 = Fiorelli, *Catalogo*, n. 1954: *Νεικοδημος ὁ ἀρχὼν Σιβουρησίων*. On the *Subura*, see Pauly's *Real-Enc. der class. Alterthumswissensch.* vi. 1. 526. At the commencement of the imperial age it was of course forbidden to celebrate any foreign *sacra* in Rome proper, i.e. within the *pomaerium* (see Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 1878, p. 35). But from the second century it was no longer so. Since then it was quite permissible to have Jewish synagogues also within the *pomaerium*.

¹⁰⁴ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9909.

¹⁰⁵ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9904. De Rossi, *Bullettino*, v. 1867, p. 16. For the name, comp. also § 27, p. 74.

Roman inscriptions,¹⁰⁶ but likewise on those at Venosa¹⁰⁷ and elsewhere.¹⁰⁸ This title cannot have been intended to refer to any other than the president or head of the *γερουσία*. But from the designation *γερουσιάρχης συναγωγῆς Αὐγουστησίων* it is evident, as has been already pointed out above, that each of the Roman communities had its own *γερουσία*, with its own officials. In view of this fact it is highly instructive to find, that upon the Roman inscriptions we nowhere meet with the title *πρεσβύτερος* (or any other like it, by which to denote the member of the *γερουσία* as such; for the *ἄρχοντες* were certainly not ordinary members, but the committee of the *γερουσία*). This fact can only be accounted for from the circumstance that it is only the *offices* properly so called that are mentioned by name upon the epitaphs, whereas the "elders" were not looked upon as officials in the technical sense of the word. They were the representatives and advisers of their community, but not officials with specific functions entrusted to them. (2) The title *ἄρχων* is of very frequent occurrence in the Roman inscriptions.¹⁰⁹ We have already met with it elsewhere, viz. in Antioch, Alexandria, and Berenice. It also occurs sometimes upon epitaphs found outside of Rome,¹¹⁰ and

¹⁰⁶ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9902 = Fiorelli, *Catal.* n. 1956: *Κυντιανὸς γερουσιάρχης συναγωγῆς Αὐγουστησίων*. Garrucci, *Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei*, p. 51: Ἀστερίφ γερουσιάρχῃ (sic). *Ibid.* p. 62: Οὐρσακίου ἀπὸ Ακουιλείας γερουσιάρχου. *Ibid.* p. 96: Πανχάρης γερουσιάρχης. Garrucci, *Dissertazioni*, ii. 183, n. 27: Θαιόφιλ[ος γερο]υσιάρχης.

¹⁰⁷ Ascoli, *Inscrizioni*, p. 55, n. 10 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. 6213 = Lenormant, *Revue des études juives*, vol. vi. n. 12, p. 204: Φανστινὸς γερουσιάρχων ἀρχίατρος. Ascoli, p. 58, n. 15 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 6221: *filius Viti ierusiarentis*. Observe in both instances the form *γερουσιάρχων*, whereas on the Roman inscriptions it is always *γερουσιάρχης* that is used.

¹⁰⁸ Mommsen, *Inscr. Regni Neap.* n. 2555 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 1893 (at Murano, near Naples): Ti. Claudius Philippus dia viu et gerusiarches.

¹⁰⁹ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* nn. 9906, 6447, 6337. Garrucci, *Cimitero*, pp. 35, 51, 61, 67. *Ibid.* *Dissertazioni*, ii. 158, n. 4, 164, 15, 16, 17, 18. De Rossi, *Bullettino*, v. 16. For more on this point, see my work, *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom*. p. 20 ff.

¹¹⁰ De Rossi, *Bullettino*, iv. 40: Κλαύδιος Ἰωσήs ἄρχων (at Porto, near

we may add that Tertullian classes the priest, Levite, and *archon* together as Jewish officials.¹¹¹ According to all analogy elsewhere (comp. especially Alexandria and Berenice) it may be taken for granted, in the case of the Roman communities as well, that *each of them* would have several ἄρχοντες, who would act as the managing committee of the γερουσία. It would appear from the title δις ἄρχων, which is repeatedly met with, that the archons were appointed for a definite period;¹¹² and in a *Homilia in S. Johannis Natalem*, ascribed to Chrysostom, and which has specially in view the state of matters in Italy during the imperial times, we are expressly informed that the archons *were always elected in September, the beginning of the civil year of the Jews*. The following are the *ipsissima verba* of this interesting passage:¹¹³ Inter haec intuendae sunt temporum qualitates et gesta morum; et primum perfidia Judaeorum, qui semper in Deum et in Mosem contumaces exstiterunt, qui cum a Deo secundum Mosem initium anni mensem Martium acceperint, illi dictum pravitatis sive superbiae exercentes mensem Septembrem, ipsum novum annum nuncupant, quo et mense magistratus sibi designant, quos Archontas vocant. But besides the appointments for a definite period, there seem also to have been cases in which the appointment was for life. At least it is probable that the enigmatical title διὰ βίου, which is repeatedly met with, is

Rome). Mommsen, *Inscr. Regni Neap.* n. 3657 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 3905: Alfius Juda arcon arcosynagogus (at Capua).

¹¹¹ Tertullian, *De corona*, chap. ix.: Quis denique patriarches, quis prophetae, quis levites aut sacerdos aut archon, quis vel postea apostolus aut evangelizator aut episcopus invenitur coronatus?

¹¹² *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9910 (for a facsimile of which see Engeström, *Om Judarne i Rom*, 1876, as a supplement): Σαββάτις δις ἄρχων. Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 47: Μάρων β' ἄρχ(ων).

¹¹³ This homily (according to Wesseling, *De Judaeorum archontibus*, chap. x.) is to be found in Chrysostomi *Opp.* vol. ii. ed. Paris 1687. As I have no means of consulting this edition, I quote the passage as given by Wesseling.

to be understood as referring to archons who were elected for life.¹¹⁴

As in Palestine so also in Rome and Italy, and in fact through the diaspora generally, we meet with the office of the ἀρχισυνάγωγος.¹¹⁵ We have already (§ 27, p. 64) said all that is necessary to say regarding the difference between this office and that of the γερονσιάρχης and the ἄρχοντες. The archisynagogus is not simply the president of the community, but he is entrusted with the special task of conducting and supervising the meetings for religious purposes. Of course he may have been chosen from among the ἄρχοντες, so that the same person might thus be an archon

¹¹⁴ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9903 = Fiorelli, *Catalogo*, 1960: Δατίβου τοῦ ζα (= διὰ) βίου ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν Αὐγουστησίων. *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9907: Ζώσιμος διὰ βίου συναγωγῆς Ἀγριππησίων. Garrucci, *Dissertazioni* ii. 184, n. 29: Αἰλία Πατρικία Τουλλιο Εἰρηναῖο κοινουγι βενεμερεντι Φηκετ διαβιο. Mommsen, *Inscr. Regni Neap.* 2555 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 1893: Ti Claudius Philippus dia viu et gerusiarches. Mommsen, *IRN.* 7190 = Fiorelli, *Catalogo*, 1962: Tettius Rufinus Melitius viexit annis LXXXV. iabius. Ascoli, *Inscrizioni*, p. 51, n. 2 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 6208: Ταφος Ἀνα διαβίου. Ascoli has advanced certain objections to the above-mentioned explanation at p. 112 of his *Inscrizioni*. Certainly in the case of some of those inscriptions (where the expression διὰ βίου comes in at the end) the correctness of this explanation may be questioned. In any case the inscription: εὐτιχίτε, ὁ γάμος διὰ βίου, discovered by Clermont-Ganneau in Emmaus = Nicopolis in Palestine, is not pertinent to the matter now in hand (*Archives des missions scientifiques*, 3rd series, vol. ix. 1882, pp. 307-310; also in *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs*, iii. 81). This seems to have been merely the expression of some one's good wishes on the occasion of a marriage: "May the union last διὰ βίου."

¹¹⁵ In Rome, *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9906: Ἰουλιανοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου. Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 67: Stafulo arconti et archisynagogo. In Capua, Mommsen, *Inscr. Regni Neap.* 3657 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 3905: Alfius Juda arcon arcossynagogus. In Venosa, Ascoli, *Inscrizioni*, p. 49, not. 1 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 6201: Ταφος Καλλιστου νιπιου ἀρχοσ-συναγωγου (sic). Ascoli, p. 52, n. 4 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 6232 = Lenormant, *Revue des études juives*, vol. vi. n. 12, p. 203: Ταφος Ασηλουνα ἀρχοσηνωγουγου. Ascoli, p. 57, n. 12 = CIL, vol. ix. n. 6205 = Lenormant, p. 204: Ταφος Ἰωσηφ ἀρχησυναγωγος νιως Ἰωσηφ ἀρχησυναγωγου. For the rest of the material, see § 27, p. 63.

and an archisynagogus at one and the same time. But as the inscriptions plainly show, the two offices were in themselves quite distinct. On the later use of the title ἀρχι-συνάγωγος by women and children, and that merely as a title and nothing more, see above, p. 65. Besides the archisynagogus there was also another who had certain functions to discharge in connection with the meetings for public worship, and that was the synagogue officer (ὑπηρέτης), an official who is also once mentioned upon a Roman inscription.¹¹⁶ Lastly, the titles *pater synagogae* and *mater synagogae* are pretty often met with on the inscriptions.¹¹⁷ The circumstance of the title occurring also in this last-mentioned form should of itself render it probable that it was not intended to denote by it an office in the proper sense of the word, but simply an honourable position in the community. It was one that was applied, above all, to aged members, and to such of them as the community was indebted to for some good service or other.¹¹⁸

2. Their Political Position.

The Jewish communities are by no means a unique phenomenon within the circle of the Graeco-Roman world. In the Hellenistic period all the larger seaports of the Mediterranean

¹¹⁶ Garrucci, *Dissertazioni*, ii. 166, n. 22: Φλάβιος Ιουλιανὸς ὑπηρέτης.

¹¹⁷ πατήρ συναγωγῆς, *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9904, 9905, 9908, 9909. Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 52. *Ibid.* *Dissertazioni*, ii. 161, n. 10. *Pater synagogae*, Orelli-Henzen, *Inscr. Lat.* n. 6145 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. viii. n. 8499. *Codex Theodosianus* (ed. Haenel), xvi. 8. 4: Hier eos et archisynagogos et patres synagogarum et ceteros, qui synagogis deservunt. *Pater* (without anything more), Garrucci, *Dissertazioni*, ii. 164, n. 18. Ascoli, p. 58, n. 15 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 6221. Ascoli, p. 61, n. 19 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 648 and 6220 = Lenormant, p. 205 sq. *Mater synagogae*, *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. v. n. 4411. Orelli, 2522.

¹¹⁸ Comp. the ages given in *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9904: Πανχάριος πατήρ συναγωγῆς ἑλίας ἐτῶν ἑκατῶν (sic) δέκα. Orelli 2522, Beturia Paulini . . . quae bixit an. LXXXVI. meses VI. . . mater synagogarum Campi et Bolumni.

came to be closely connected with each other in consequence of the brisk trade that was carried on between them, the result of which was that not only Jews, but also Phoenicians, Syrians, Egyptians and inhabitants of Asia Minor settled in larger or smaller numbers in many of the principal towns of Greece and Italy. All the settlers belonging to the same nation were naturally led by a community of temporal and spiritual interests, above all by their common worship, to band themselves together for mutual help, and consequently to unite themselves under a common organization. Wherever a considerable number of them happened to be living together, there they formed themselves into a separate society, and that principally for the purpose of maintaining their native worship in their midst. Consequently, just as there were diaspora communities composed of Jews, so in like manner there were those composed of Phoenicians, Egyptians, and so on. As early as the year 333 B.C. the Athenians issued a decree granting permission to the merchants from Citium (ἔμποροι Κιτιεῖς) to erect a temple to Aphrodite in the Piræus, it being mentioned at the same time that the Egyptians (οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι) had already built a temple to Isis in the same place (*Corp. Inscr. Attic.* ii. 1, n. 168). At the beginning of the second century B.C. we find a community of Tyrian merchants in the island of Delos (*Corp. Inscr. Græc.* 2271: ἡ σύνοδος τῶν Τυρίων ἐμπόρων καὶ ναυκλήρων).¹¹⁹ Then we learn from an inscription belonging to the year 174 A.D. that at that date there lived in Puteoli a community of Tyrians who requested assistance from home to enable them to carry on the observance of their native worship (*Corp. Inscr. Græc.* 5853: οἱ ἐν Ποτιόλοις κατοικοῦντες, scil. Τύριοι).¹²⁰ In Puteoli there were

¹¹⁹ On the date of this inscription, see Foucart, *Des associations religieuses chez les Grecs*, p. 225. At pp. 223-225 of this work we also find a more correct text of the inscription than that of the *Corp. Inscr.*

¹²⁰ On this interesting inscription, comp. the commentary of Mommsen

also cultores Iovis Heliopolitani Berytenses qui Puteolis consistunt (Orelli, *Inscr. Lat.* 1246 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 1634). But these Orientals, when they came to the West, were not contented with merely forming themselves into such communities as we have just referred to, but exactly like the Jews they endeavoured to win converts to their religion among the Greeks and Romans, and that sometimes with great success. We know in fact that even in early times the Greek religion owed not a little to the influence of the East. In the Hellenistic period again Oriental worships came to be more and more in vogue. Then as early as the latter days of the Republic we find the worship of the Egyptian gods already naturalized in Rome, while this was followed by the establishment in imperial times of the Syrian and Persian worships, above all that of Mithras (for more on this point, see No. 5, below). With the view of cultivating those worships, where they did not happen to be established and maintained directly by the State itself, the adherents of them also formed themselves into religious associations which, as regards their internal organization and their political position, are to be conceived of as being in every respect analogous to the corporations of foreign merchants mentioned above. Both in Greece and in Rome the law of the land contained express legal provisions for the benefit of those associations under the shelter of which it became possible for them to attain to a highly flourishing condition. In Greece these associations are met with from the beginning of the fourth century B.C. downwards, and that under the name of *θιάσσοι* or *ἑπάροι*. And notwithstanding their diversity otherwise, they are all characterized by certain common features, as might be expected from their being all of them so far under State regulation.¹²¹ In Rome again, and

in the transactions of the *Sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissensch.*, philologico-historical department, 1850, p. 57 sqq.

¹²¹ On the religious associations in Greece, comp. Wescher, *Revue archéo*

that from an early period, there were *collegia* for a great variety of purposes, sometimes for objects chiefly religious, sometimes for those of a political character (but forbidden since the time of Caesar and Augustus), sometimes with a view to the mutual help of their members, above all for the purpose of securing them honourable burial (*collegia tenuiorum*, *collegia funeraticia*). The main distinction between these and the *sacerdotia publica populi Romani* lay in this, that while recognised by the State they were not publicly endowed, but had to depend for their support upon the voluntary contributions of their members.¹²²

The position of voluntary religious associations as we have here described it, was precisely that which the *Jewish communities* also occupied now both in Greece and Rome, except in those instances in which, as in Alexandria, they enjoyed political privileges of a still more extensive character, which however was certainly not the case in Greece proper

logique, new series, vol. x. 1864, p. 460 sqq., xii. 1865, p. 214 sqq., xiii. 1866, p. 245 sqq. Foucart, *Des associations religieuses chez les Grecs, thiasés, éranes, orgéons, avec la texte des inscriptions relatives à ces associations*, Paris 1873. Lüder's *Die dionysischen Künstler*, Berlin 1873. Heinrici, *Die Christengemeinde Korinths und die religiösen Genossenschaften der Griechen* (*Zeitschr. für Wissensch. Theol.* 1876, pp. 465-526, particularly p. 479 sqq.). Idem, *Zur Geschichte der Anfänge paulinischer Gemeinden* (*ibid.* 1877, pp. 89-130). Neumann, *Θεσσαλονίκης Ἰνσοῦ* (*Jahrb. für prot. Theol.* 1885, pp. 123-125).

¹²² On the Roman *collegia*, comp. above all Mommsen, *De collegiis et sodaliciis*, 1843. Idem, *Zeitschr. für geschichtl. Rechtswissenschaft*, vol. xv. 1850, p. 353 sqq. Max Cohn, *Zum römischen Vereinsrecht*, Berlin 1873 (and the notice of it in Bursian's *Philol. Jahresbericht*, 1873, ii. 885-890). Boissier, *La religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins*, 2nd ed. 1878, ii. 238-304. Duruy, *Du régime municipal dans l'empire romain* (*Revue historique*, vol. i. 1876, p. 355 sqq.). De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea*, vol. iii. 1877, p. 37 sqq., and especially p. 507 sqq. For an excellent summary of the whole matter, consult Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 1878, pp. 131-142. For additional literature, see Hatch, *Die Gesellschaftsverfassung der christlichen Kirchen im Alterthum* (German edition, 1883), p. 20. A considerable amount of material is furnished by the indices to the *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* The *Digest*, xlvii. 22, de *collegiis et corporibus*, is important as bearing upon the juridical side of the matter.

nor in Rome. In the dominions of the *Ptolemies* and the *Seleucidae* the toleration of the Jewish communities and their religion was simply a matter of course. Indeed the first of the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae conferred important political privileges upon the Jews who resided within their kingdoms (see below, paragraph 3). Ptolemy II. is said to have gone even the length of causing the Jewish law to be translated into Greek, and Ptolemy III. to have gone so far as to offer sacrifice in Jerusalem.¹²³ No doubt when it was becoming more and more evident that the Jews were disposed to treat Hellenism rather contemptuously, and that unlike all other nations they insisted in maintaining a strong wall of partition, so far as religious matters were concerned, between themselves and every other people, several kings such as *Antiochus Epiphanes* for example tried to break down this opposition—tried to suppress the Jewish religion by force. But history teaches us that every attempt to do this only proved a failure, and we find that on the whole the toleration of former days continues to be enjoyed in later times as well. One of the foremost among the friends of the Jews was Ptolemy VI. (Philometor), who went so far as to sanction the erection of a Jewish temple in Egypt (see paragraph 4, below). And if Ptolemy VII. (Physcon) assumed an attitude of hostility toward the Jews, he did so not because of their religious, but their political partisanship.¹²⁴ In a similar way the *legislation*

¹²³ On the friendly disposition generally of the first Ptolemies toward the Jews, see Josephus, *contra Apion.* ii. 4–5.

¹²⁴ Josephus (*c. Apion.* ii. 5) relates the following incident in connection with Ptolemy VII. (Physcon): After the death of Ptolemy VI., Ptolemy VII. tried to supplant Cleopatra the widow and successor of the former, and whose army was under the command of the Jewish general Onias. Well then when Ptolemy was marching out against Onias he ordered the Jews of Alexandria to be put in chains and then thrown down in the way of the elephants, in order that these might trample upon them and crush them. But instead of that, the elephants turned against the friends of the king, who on seeing this regretted what he had done and at once desisted. By

of the Romans expressly conceded to the Jews the free observance of their own religion, and extended its protection to them when sundry attempts were made to suppress it. But it was Caesar and Augustus to whom they were chiefly indebted for their formal recognition within the Roman Empire. Josephus (*Antt.* xiv. 10, xvi. 6) has transmitted to us a large number of public enactments, partly decrees of the Senate, partly edicts of Caesar and Augustus, and partly those of certain Roman officials or municipal authorities of that period—all of which have as their object the securing to the Jews of the free observance of their own religion, and the further confirmation of their privileges.¹²⁵ As a rule the policy of Caesar was peculiarly unfavourable to those free unions, because at that time they were often made use of for political purposes, and so for this reason the emperor found it necessary to prohibit all *collegia* except those of ancient standing.¹²⁶ But the Jewish

way of commemorating this miraculous escape the Jews of Alexandria have been in the habit ever since of holding a thanksgiving festival every year. The story of the miraculous escape from being crushed to death by the elephants also forms the main subject of that absurd piece of romance known as the *third Book of Maccabees*, where it is likewise mentioned that the Jews have observed an annual thanksgiving festival ever since (3 Macc. vi. 36). Here however it is not Ptolemy VII. but Ptolemy IV. that is the hero of the story. This parallel, as well as the contents themselves, tend to make the story more than doubtful. But if this much be historical, that Ptolemy VII. assumed an attitude of hostility towards the Jews, then it was not in consequence of their religion that he did so, but owing to their having espoused the side of Cleopatra.

¹²⁵ On those enactments, comp. Gronovius, *Decreta Romana et Asiatica pro Judaeis*, Lugd. Bat. 1712. Krebs, *Decreta Romanorum pro Judaeis facta e Josepho collecta*, Lips. 1768. Mendelssohn, *Senati consulta Romanorum quae sunt in Josephi Antiquitatibus* (*Acta societatis phil.*, Lips. ed. Ritschellius, vol. v. 1875, pp. 87–288). The notice of this work in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1876, pp. 390–396. Niese, *Bemerkungen über die Urkunden bei Josephus Archäol.*, books xiii. xiv. xvi. (*Hermes*, vol. xi. 1876, pp. 466–488). Mendelssohn's reply to the latter, *Rhein. Museum*, new series, xxxii. 1877, pp. 249–258. For additional literature, see § 3, above (the paragraph on Josephus).

¹²⁶ Sueton. *Caesar*, xlii: Cuncta collegia praeter antiquitus constituta

communities were expressly exempted, it being further ordained that in future they were not to be forbidden to have a common fund of their own, and to hold meetings or gatherings.¹²⁷ And accordingly on one occasion we find a Roman official appealing to this decree when issuing instructions to the authorities of Paros not to interfere with the Jews in the practice of their religious observances.¹²⁸ In like manner the four public enactments, which Josephus has brought together in *Antt.* xiv. 10. 20–24, are doubtless to be traced to the influence of Caesar. They all of them serve directly or indirectly to guarantee to the Jews of Asia Minor the undisturbed exercise of their own religious observances.¹²⁹ After

distraxit. The prohibition was subsequently repeated by Augustus, Sueton. *Aug.* xxxii.: *Collegia praeter antiqua et legitima dissolvit.*

¹²⁷ *Antt.* xiv. 10. 8: Καὶ γὰρ Γαίος Καῖσαρ ὁ ἡμέτερος στρατηγὸς καὶ ὕπατος ἐν διατάγματι καλῶν θιάσους συνάγεσθαι κατὰ πόλιν, μόνους τούτους οὐκ ἐκώλυσεν οὔτε χρήματα συνεισφέρειν οὔτε σύνδειπνα ποιεῖν.

¹²⁸ *Antt.* xiv. 10. 8. The texts of those documents are reproduced so carelessly that in many instances it is no longer possible to make out who the Roman names are intended for. The name of the official who addressed the communication to the Parians is given in the transmitted text as 'Ιούλιος Γαίος, which in any case is a corruption. Mendelssohn (*Acta societatis philol.*, Lips. v. pp. 212–216) conjectures that it is Σερούιλιος Ουατίας, proconsul of Asia 46–45 B.C., that is meant.

¹²⁹ The four enactments are as follow: (1) A communication from the authorities of Laodicea to a Roman official (proconsul of Asia?), in which they assure him that, in conformity with his instructions, they would not interfere with the Jews in the observance of the Sabbath and the practice of their own religious usages (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 20). (2) A communication from the proconsul of Asia to the authorities of Miletus, in which these latter are enjoined not to interfere with the Jews in their observance of the Sabbath, and in the practice of their religious rites, and to allow them to dispose of their earnings in the way they have been accustomed to, τοὺς καρποὺς μεταχειρίζεσθαι καθὼς ἔθος ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 21). (3) A public decree of the city of Halicarnassus (ψήφισμα Ἀλικαρνασσεύων), pursuant to which the Jews were to be allowed, τὰ τε σάββατα ἄγειν καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ συντελεῖν κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαϊκοὺς νόμους καὶ τὰς προσευχὰς ποιῆσθαι πρὸς τῇ θαλάσῃ κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἔθος (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 23; on the offering up prayers by the seashore, see § 27, p. 72). (4) A public decree of the town of Sardes, to the effect (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 24) that the Jews were to

the death of Caesar the two contending parties vied with each other in maintaining the privileges of the Jews. On the one side we find Dolabella, the warm supporter of Antony, and who in the year 43 B.C. took possession of Asia Minor, ratifying the privilege of exemption from military service, and of observing their own religious worship conferred upon the Jews of that province by previous governors, and sending a communication to the authorities of Ephesus to apprise them of this.¹⁸⁰ On the other again we find Marcus Junius Brutus, who in Asia Minor was preparing in the spring of the year 42 B.C. to march against Antony and Octavianus, prevailing upon the people of Ephesus to issue a public edict declaring that the Jews were not to be interfered with in the observance of the Sabbath and their other sacred usages.¹⁸¹ *In consequence of all this, Judaism acquired such a legal standing that it came to be treated as a religio licita throughout the whole extent of* be allowed to meet on the days appointed by them for the celebration of their religious observances, and further that the magistrates of the town were to assign them a place of their own "on which to build and in which to reside" (εἰς οἰκοδομίαν καὶ οἰκῆσαι αὐτῶν, though from the petition of the Jews previously mentioned it would appear that it was only the building of a synagogue that was in question). These enactments seem to be traceable to one and the same stimulus emanating from Rome. Mendelssohn's conjecture, that the stimulus in question was a decree of the Senate, passed in the year 46 B.C., is doubtful. See Mendelssohn, *Acta societatis philol.*, Lips. vol. v. pp. 205 sq., 211 sq., 217-228. For the name of the proconsul who addressed the injunction to the Milesians (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 21), see Bergmann, *Philologus*, 1847, p. 684. Waddington, *Fastes des provinces asiatiques de l'empire romain*, pt. i. 1872 (reprinted from Le Bas et Waddington's *Inscriptions*, vol. iii.), p. 75, and Mendelssohn's reply in his notice of the work in the *Jenaër Literaturzeitung*, 1874, art. 341. Ritschl, *Rhein. Museum*, 1874, p. 340 f. Mendelssohn, *Acta*, v. 212 f. The probable reading is Πόπλιος Σερούιλιος Ποπλίου υἱὸς Οὐατίας (Vatia).

¹⁸⁰ *Antt.* xiv. 10. 11-12. Mendelssohn's observations on this passage, *Acta*, v. 247-250.

¹⁸¹ *Antt.* xiv. 10. 25. Mendelssohn's observations on the passage, *Acta*, v. 251-254. In the generally received text the name of *M. Junius Brutus* is corrupted into Μάρκω Ἰουλίῳ Πομπηίῳ υἱῷ Βρούτου. For various suggestions as to how it might be corrected, see Bergmann, *Philologus*, 1847 p. 687, note. Waddington, *Fastes*, p. 74. Mendelssohn, *Acta*, v. 254.

the Roman Empire.¹³² That the Jews living in the city of Rome also shared in these legal privileges is specially vouched for by Philo with regard to the time of Augustus.¹³³ At the same time, if we may judge from what we know to have been the case in regard to other foreign worships, it must be assumed that down to the second century of our era the Jews of Rome were not at liberty to celebrate their religious observances within the *pomaerium*.¹³⁴

In the recognition of the Jewish communities and their worship on the part of the State two important privileges are virtually included: the *right of administering their own funds and jurisdiction over their own members*. To the former of these prominence had already been given over and over again in the edicts issued in Caesar's time.¹³⁵ This was a matter of special importance to the Jews, as otherwise they would have been unable to fulfil their obligations to the

¹³² The expression *religio licita* is derived from Tertullian, *Apologet.* chap. xxi.: *insignissima religio, certe licita*. It does not otherwise belong to the technical phraseology of Roman legislation. This latter speaks rather of *collegia licita* (*Digest.* xlvii. 22). For the decisive point here lies in this, that to the adherents of any particular worship permission is granted to organize themselves as a corporation and to meet together for the celebration of their worship. Hence the formula *coire, convenire licet*, which is also of frequent occurrence in the toleration edicts issued in favour of the Jews.

¹³³ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23 (Mang. ii. 568 f.). It is there stated with reference to the way in which Augustus had acted toward the Jews of Rome that: 'Ἡπίστατο οὖν καὶ προσευχὰς ἔχοντας καὶ συνιόντας εἰς αὐτὰς, καὶ μάλιστα ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἐβδόμαῖς, ὅτε δημοσίᾳ τὴν πάτριον παιδεύονται φιλοσοφίαν. 'Ἡπίστατο καὶ χρήματα συναγαγόντας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπαρχῶν ἱερὰ, καὶ πέμποντας εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα διὰ τῶν τὰς θυσίας ἀναξόντων. 'Αλλ' ὁ μὲν οὔτε ἐξέφικε τῆς Ῥώμης ἐκεῖνους, οὔτε τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν αὐτῶν ἀφείλετο πολιτείαν, ὅτι τῆς καὶ Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἐφρόντιζεν, οὔτε ἐνωτέρωσεν εἰς τὰς προσευχὰς, οὔτε ἐκώλυσε συνάγεσθαι πρὸς τὰς τῶν νόμων ὑφηγήσεις, οὔτε ἡναντιώθη τοῖς ἀπαρχομένοις. Comp. also *ibid.* § 40 (Mang. ii. 592).

¹³⁴ Comp. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 35.

¹³⁵ Caesar himself conferred upon the Jews the right *χρήματα συνεισφέρειν* (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 21). In the communication addressed by the proconsul of Asia to the Milesians (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 21), permission is given to the Jews τοὺς καρποὺς μεταχειρίζεσθαι καθὼς ἔθος ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς.

temple at Jerusalem and to send thither the tribute prescribed by the law. But it was precisely this draining away of money from the provinces that seemed peculiarly offensive in the eyes of the Gentile authorities. We learn from Cicero's speech in behalf of Flaccus, that this latter, during his administration of Asia, in several places confiscated the money thus collected by Jews with the view of forwarding it to Jerusalem.¹⁸⁶ Further, the municipal authorities in Asia would seem to have gone on acting in a similar manner even after the edicts of Caesar's time and actually in defiance of them. Consequently the public documents belonging to the time of Augustus refer principally to this point. As Augustus had sanctioned the remitting of these sums of money from Rome itself,¹⁸⁷ so the municipalities of Asia Minor and Cyrene are enjoined not to interpose any obstacle in the way of the Jews in regard to this matter.¹⁸⁸ Further, the appropriation of all such monies was to be punished as sacrilege.¹⁸⁹ And that those decrees

¹⁸⁶ Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, xxviii.: Quum aurum Judaeorum nomine quotannis ex Italia et ex omnibus provinciis Hierosolyma exportari soleret, Flaccus sanxit edicto, ne ex Asia exportari liceret. . . . Ubi ergo crimen est? quoniam quidem furtum nusquam reprehendis, edictum probas, judicatum fateris, quaesitum et prolatum palam non negas, actum esse per viros primarios res ipsa declarat: Apameae manifestum deprehensum, ante pedes praetoris in foro expensum esse auri pondo centum paullo minus per Sex. Caesium, equitem Romanum, castissimum hominem atque integerrimum; Laodiceae viginti pondo paullo amplius per hunc L. Peducaeam, judicem nostrum, Adramyttii per Cn. Domitium legatum; Pergami non multum. Previous to this Mithridates had appropriated the sums belonging to the Jews in Cos (*Antt.* xiv. 7. 2).

¹⁸⁷ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23 (ed. Mang. ii. 568 sq.).

¹⁸⁸ Joseph. *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 40 (ed. Mang. ii. 592).

¹⁸⁹ *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2, 4. The decrees which Josephus has collected in *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2-7 have evidently been the outcome of those negotiations, an account of which is given in *Antt.* xvi. 2. 3-5 (comp. also xii. 3. 2). When, for example, Herod happened to be visiting Agrippa in Asia Minor in the year 14 B.C., the Jews in that quarter took occasion to complain of the oppression to which they were being subjected at the hands of the municipal authorities throughout the province, declaring that they had been

were still in force in the time of the Vespasian war is evident from an incidental utterance that on one occasion fell from the lips of Titus.¹⁴⁰ It was a matter of no less importance to the Jews to be allowed *to exercise jurisdiction over the members of their own community*. For, as the Mosaic law concerned itself not only with acts of worship but with the affairs of ordinary life as well, these latter being also subjected to the regulative principles of a divine law, it was utterly repugnant to Jewish ideas of things that they should be tried by any other than Jewish law.¹⁴¹ Wherever the Jews went they took their own law along with them, and in accordance with it they administered justice among the members of their community. Evidences of this are to be found above all in the New Testament. The Apostle Paul, for example, obtains a warrant from the Sanhedrim in Jerusalem for the arrest of certain converts to Christianity among the Jews living in Damascus (Acts ix. 2). In other places again he causes such converts to be put in prison and scourged (Acts xxii. 19 xxvi. 11). Subsequently he himself was scourged by the Jews five times for being a Christian (2 Cor. xi. 24), on which occasions it is doubtless Jewish communities living abroad that are in question and not those of Palestine. In Corinth the proconsul Gallio directs the Jews to carry their complaint against Paul before their own authorities, on the ground that he would be prepared to interfere only if Paul had been charged with a criminal offence, but not if it was merely a question of transgressing the Jewish law (Acts xviii. 12–16); despoiled of the money intended for the temple, and that they were compelled to appear in the courts of law on the Sabbath. Agrippa protected the Jews against any invasion of their rights in regard to both of those matters. But it was also to these very points that the toleration edicts in question had reference.

¹⁴⁰ *Bell. Jud.* vi. 6. 2 (Bekker, pp. 107, 22 sqq.): *δασμολογεῖν τε ὑμῖν ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἀναθήματα συλλέγειν ἐπετρέψαμεν κ.τ.λ.*

¹⁴¹ Comp. the Rabbinical passages in Wetstein, *Nov. Test.*, note on 1 Cor. vi. 1.

and then he quietly looks on and allows the Jews to maltreat Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, under his very eyes (Acts xviii. 17). From all this it will be seen that practically at all events the Jews exercised not only civil, but even criminal jurisdiction over the members of their communities. But whether they were actually warranted in doing so is open to question. In any case the foreign communities would doubtless be subject to certain restrictions in this respect, similar to those imposed upon the Jews in Palestine in the time of the procurators. But it is certain that in *civil causes* they enjoyed an independent jurisdiction, not merely in Alexandria (see above, p. 244), but elsewhere as well. Even before the time of Caesar we find such jurisdiction expressly conceded to the Jews of Sardes in a communication addressed to the authorities of that town by Lucius Antonius (governor of the province of Asia in 50-49 B.C.).¹⁴² And we see from the legislation of the Christian emperors that in later times as well the Jewish communities were everywhere left in the enjoyment of this privilege (see below at the close of the present paragraph).

As the requirements of Jewish legalism might easily bring the Jews of the dispersion into collision with the arrangements of civil life, they could hope to enjoy the absolutely free exercise of their own religion only in those cases where the civil legislation and government did not require of them anything that was incompatible with their own law. But even in this respect Roman tolerance made large concessions

¹⁴² Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 10. 17: Ἰουδαῖοι πολῖται ἡμέτεροι προσελθόντες μοι ἐπέδειξαν ἑαυτοὺς σύνοδον ἔχειν ἰδίαν κατὰ τοῦ πατρίους νόμους ἀπ' ἀρχῆς καὶ τόπον ἰδίου, ἐν ᾧ τὰ τε πράγματα καὶ τὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀντιλογίας κρίνουσι· τοῦτό τε αἰτησάμενοις ἵν' ἐξῇ αὐτοῖς ποιεῖν, τηρῆσαι καὶ ἐπιτρέψαι ἔκρινα. On L. Antonius, a brother of the triumvir M. Antony, see Pauly's *Encyclop.* i. 1. 1182 sq. Bergmann, *Philologus*, 1847, p. 680. Waddington, *Fastes*, p. 63. Mendelssohn, *Acta societatis phil.*, Lips. v. 169, 186.

to the Jews. One of the most important of them was *exemption from military service*. For Jews to perform such service in any but a Jewish army would be simply impossible, for on the Sabbath they were forbidden either to bear arms or to march farther than 2000 cubits.¹⁴³ This matter assumed a somewhat practical character when, at the breaking out of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey in the year 47 B.C., Pompey's party endeavoured to raise large levies of troops throughout the whole of the East. In the province of Asia alone the consul Lentulus raised as many as two legions of Roman citizens.¹⁴⁴ Now if it was the case, as precisely on this very occasion we are informed it was, that in that quarter there was also a large number of Jews who enjoyed the rights of Roman citizenship, then they too would be liable to this conscription. But at their own request Lentulus granted them the privilege of exemption from military service, and issued instructions to this effect to all the authorities everywhere who had charge of the conscription.¹⁴⁵ Then six years after this (43 B.C.) Dolabella confirmed the Jews of this same province in their privilege of *ἀστυπεία*, and in doing so he expressly appealed to the previous edicts.¹⁴⁶ In Palestine also was this same privilege conceded to them by Caesar.¹⁴⁷ Among the *other privileges* that were conceded to them in deference to the requirements of Jewish legalism, we might further mention that, in pursuance of an order to that effect by Augustus, the Jews were not to be

¹⁴³ For the prohibition with regard to bearing arms, consult Mishna, *Shabbath* vi. 2-4; and for the marching, see above, p. 102; also *Antt.* xiii. 8. 4, xiv. 10. 12.

¹⁴⁴ Caesar, *Bell. Civ.* iii. 4: (Pompejus) legiones effecerat civium Romanorum IX. . . . duas ex Asia, quas Lentulus consul conscribendas curaverat.

¹⁴⁵ *Antt.* xiv. 10. 13, 14, 16, 18, 19. Comp. Mendelssohn on this passage in *Acta soc. phil.*, Lips. v. 167-188; *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1876, p. 393.

¹⁴⁶ *Antt.* xiv. 10. 11-12.

¹⁴⁷ *Antt.* xiv. 10. 6.

compelled to appear in a court of law on the Sabbath;¹⁴⁸ that when a public distribution of money or corn took place and the day of the distribution fell on a Sabbath, then in pursuance of a similar order by the same emperor, their share of the money or the corn was to be delivered to them on the day following;¹⁴⁹ and lastly, that instead of the oil furnished by the provinces and which Jews were forbidden to make use of, they were to receive an equivalent in money,—a usage the continuance of which was confirmed to the Jews of Antioch, for example, by the governor Mucianus in the time of the Vespasian war.¹⁵⁰

This whole position of the Jews with regard to their enjoyment of public rights was never materially or permanently altered at any subsequent period. Sometimes no doubt the imperial legislation introduced certain restrictions, and Judaism was also subjected now and then to temporary persecution. But nothing of the nature of a lasting or material change took place in the existing state of things till down toward later imperial times. The measures used by Tiberius against Roman Jews were confined exclusively to the city of Rome. No doubt a serious crisis arose in the time of Caligula. But it was precisely in such a crisis that it was seen how important it was for the Jews to be able to take their stand upon the public rights they had now so long enjoyed. For nothing was more calculated seriously to endanger the religious freedom of the Jews than the introduction and gradual diffusion of *the worship of the emperors*. The more that such worship was being promoted by public authority, it would necessarily have more and more

¹⁴⁸ *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2 and 4 (the technical phrase ἐγγύας ὁμολογεῖν means to give a guarantee that one will appear before a court). On the occasion of those decrees, see note 139.

¹⁴⁹ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23 (ed. Mang. ii. 569).

¹⁵⁰ Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 3. 1. On the prohibition against the use of oil supplied by Gentiles, see above, § 22, vol. i. p. 55.

the appearance of an act of disloyalty on the part of the Jews when they refused to join in it. And so at a time when Caligula was everywhere peremptorily insisting upon the observance of that worship, which, ever since Augustus, had been introduced again and again by people from the provinces in the heat of their own zeal (see § 22, vol. i. p. 16), the religious freedom of the Jews would have been irretrievably lost had the demand been consistently enforced in their case as well. As long as Caligula lived the attempt to do so was actually made, and history can tell what frightful storms were conjured up for the Jews in consequence (see § 17^c). But fortunately for them the reign of Caligula was but of short duration. Claudius his successor lost no time in simply restoring the previous state of matters by issuing a decree of universal toleration.¹⁵¹ Since then the idea of forcing the Jews to take part in emperor worship has never been seriously thought of. Their title to exemption was regarded as an ancient privilege, a circumstance which placed them in a much more favourable position than the Christians enjoyed. The subsequent treatment of the Roman Jews by Claudius was confined, like that of Tiberius, to Rome itself, and did not lead to any permanent result. Even the reign of Nero, thanks to the Empress Poppaea, was on the whole favourable to the Jews (comp. note 74). The result of the great Vespasian war and the destruction of Jerusalem, so far as the Jews of the dispersion were concerned, was this, that the tax of two drachmae previously paid to the temple at Jerusalem was from that time forward to be given to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.¹⁵² No doubt to have to do this was a thing somewhat repugnant to the feelings of a Jew. But in

¹⁵¹ *Antt.* xix. 5. 2-3.

¹⁵² Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 6. Dio Cass. lxvi. 7. For the history of this tax, comp. Zorn, *Historia fisci Judaici sub imperio veterum Romanorum*, 1734.

no other respect did Vespasian do anything to prejudice the religious freedom of the Jews. Their political rights are expressly safeguarded by him even in Alexandria and Antioch for example.¹⁵³ Domitian insisted in the most rigorous manner possible upon the payment of the two drachmae tax,¹⁵⁴ and visited with severe punishment such of the Romans as became converts to Judaism.¹⁵⁵ But the existing rights of the Jews were not rescinded. Under Nerva again certain alleviations were granted with regard to both the points just mentioned. As for the two-drachmae tax, though not abolished, it was imposed in a less offensive form,¹⁵⁶ and it was no longer allowable to prosecute any one on the charge of having adopted "Jewish modes of life."¹⁵⁷ A violent disturbance of the existing state of things, nay the most violent that the Jews had ever experienced since Caligula's time, was brought about by the serious struggles that took place in the reign of Trajan and Hadrian. Hadrian had gone so far—

¹⁵³ Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 3. 1; *Bell. Jud.* vii. 5. 2. Comp. paragraph 3, below.

¹⁵⁴ Sueton. *Domitian.* xii.: *Judaicus fiscus acerbissime actus est; ad quem deferebantur, qui vel inprofessi Judaicam viverent vitam, vel dissimulata origine imposita genti tributa non pendissent. Interfuisse me adulescentulum memini, cum a procuratore frequentissimoque consilio inspiceretur nonagenarius senex, an circumsectus esset.*

¹⁵⁵ Dio Cass. lxvii. 14: *καὶ ἄλλοι ἐς τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνη ἐξοκέλλοντες πολλοὶ κατεδικάσθησαν, καὶ οἱ μὲν ἀπέθανον, οἱ δὲ τῶν γούν οὐσιῶν ἑσπερήθησαν.*

¹⁵⁶ This we are bound to infer from the coins of Nerva's time, with their inscription: *Fisci Judaici calumnia sublata* (Madden's *History of Jewish Coinage*, p. 199, and elsewhere). Seeing that the tax is found to be still in existence at a later period (Appian, *Syr.* l.; Origen, *Epist. ad African.* § 14; Tertull. *Apologet.* chap. xviii.: *vectigalis libertas*=freedom purchased by payment of a tax), what is meant cannot be that the tax was abolished altogether, but that it was exacted in a form less calculated to offend the religious scruples of the Jews. It may be conjectured that from this time forth they were not to be called upon to pay it as for the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.

¹⁵⁷ Dio Cass. lxviii. 1: *οὐτ' ἀσεβείας οὐτ' Ἰουδαϊκοῦ βίου κατατιθέσθαι τινας συνεχώρησε.*

and this was the cause of the insurrection in his time—as to issue a formal prohibition of the rite of circumcision,¹⁵⁸ a prohibition that was hardly revoked after the successful quelling of the rising. But his successor Antoninus Pius granted permission to circumcise in the case of native Jews, and confined the prohibition to Gentiles.¹⁵⁹ In like manner Septimius Severus contented himself with merely prohibiting conversions to Judaism,¹⁶⁰ and this continued to be also the standpoint of several Christian emperors who were not otherwise favourably disposed toward the Jewish religion.¹⁶¹ It will be seen therefore that the whole of the repressive measures aimed merely at preventing the further spread of Judaism. As far as native Jews were concerned, their existing public rights were not interfered with to any appreciable extent. As showing this, there are three points that are worth noting. (1) As in earlier,¹⁶² so also in later times the Jewish *worship* continued to enjoy the formal protection of the State. On one occasion when Callistus, subsequently a bishop (in the time of Bishop Victor, 189–199 A.D.), ventured to disturb Jewish worship in Rome, the Jews prosecuted him for doing so before Fascianus the prefect of the city, who sentenced the offender to be banished to the mines of Sardinia.¹⁶³ Of the Christian emperors, even those of them who were unfavourably disposed toward the Jews, and who had forbidden the building of new synagogues, had nevertheless no objection to

¹⁵⁸ Spartian. *Hadrian*. xiv.: moverunt ea tempestate et Judaei bellum, quod vetabantur mutilare genitalia.

¹⁵⁹ *Digest*. xlviii. 8. 11, pr.: Circumcidere Judaeis filios suos tantum rescripto divi Pii permittitur: in non ejusdem religionis qui hoc fecerit, castrantis poena irrogatur.

¹⁶⁰ Spartian. *Sept. Sev.* xvii.: Judaeos fieri sub gravi poena vetuit.

¹⁶¹ On this see *Codex Theodosianus*, xvi. 8.

¹⁶² Comp. especially the ψήφισμα Ἀλικαρναστέων, Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 10. 23 *ἀν δὲ τις καλῶς ἢ ἀρχῶν ἢ ιδιώτης, τῷδε τῷ ζημιώματι ὑπεύθυνος ἔσται καὶ ὀφειλέτω τῇ πόλει.*

¹⁶³ Hippolyti, *Philosophumena*, ix. 12.

place the existing ones under the protection of the laws of the empire.¹⁶⁴ (2) The Jewish communities continued to enjoy to quite the same extent as in former times the right of *administering their own funds*. Above all were they still permitted as much as ever (till toward the end of the fourth century of our era) to send their sacred tribute to the patriarchate in Palestine (the new central authority of the Jewish people after the destruction of Jerusalem). This tribute was collected every year by the *apostoli* sent out by the patriarchs for the purpose, and when thus collected it was conveyed to Palestine.¹⁶⁵ It was not till towards the close of the fourth century of our era that the civil authority began gradually to put a stop to this.¹⁶⁶ (3) In later imperial times the Jews were also permitted still to enjoy independent *jurisdiction* over the members of their own community, but of course exclusively in civil causes and only when the two parties in the case agreed to have the matter disposed of by a Jewish tribunal.¹⁶⁷ Powers of a very extensive character must have

¹⁶⁴ *Codex Theodosianus*, xvi. 8, 9, 12, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27.

¹⁶⁵ On these *apostoli* and their functions, see Euseb. *Comment. ad Jesaj.* xviii. 1 (*Collectio nova patrum*, ed. Montfaucon, ii. 425). Epiphan. *haer.* xxx. 4 and 11. Jerome, *ad Gal.* i. 1 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, vii. 1. 363). *Codex Theodos.* xvi. 8. 14. Their chief duty would seem to have been to act as media of communication between the various Jewish communities. Hence we also meet with them in later times when the collecting of the tribute in question was no longer allowed, for example, in Venosa on the epitaph of a girl fourteen years of age, *qui dixerunt trenus duo apostuli et duo rebbites* (Hirschfeld, *Bullettino dell' Istituto di corrisp. archeol.* 1867, p. 152 = Ascoli, *Inscrizioni*, p. 61, n. 19 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 648 and 6220 = Lenormant, *Revue des études juives*, vol. vi. No. 12, p. 205).

¹⁶⁶ On the suppression of this practice (which did not take place all at once), comp. Julian, *Epist.* xxv. *Codex Theodos.* xvi. 8. 14, 17, 29.

¹⁶⁷ *Cod. Theodos.* ii. 1. 10: *Sane si qui per compromissum, ad similitudinem arbitrorum, apud Judaeos vel patriarchas ex consensu partium in civili duntaxat negotio putaverint litigandum, sortiri eorum judicium jure publico non vetentur: eorum etiam sententias provinciarum judices exsequantur, tamquam ex sententia cognitoris arbitri fuerint attributi* (edict of the Emperors Arcadius and Honorius of the year 398 A.D.). Comp. further, *Cod. Theodos.* xvi. 8. 8.

been in the hands of the Jewish ethnarch or patriarch in Palestine, who after the destruction of the Jewish state formed the supreme head of the people. The whole of the communities of the dispersion seem to have submitted to his jurisdiction without any hesitation. And so full were the prerogatives he exercised, that the Fathers of the Church felt themselves under the necessity of taking very considerable pains in order to show that, notwithstanding those prerogatives, the sceptre had been taken from Judah as far back as the time of Christ.¹⁶⁸ But there is perhaps nothing that indicates better the secure basis on which those political privileges of the Jews just described were found to rest, than the circumstance that in the time of the persecution of the Christians we even find instances of these latter becoming converts to Judaism for their own safety.¹⁶⁹

3. *Their Equality in regard to the Rights of Citizenship.*

There can be no question that, in the majority of the older cities of Phoenicia, Syria, and Asia Minor, as well as in Greece proper, the Jews who went to live in them occupied the position of settlers (as opposed to citizens).^{169a} We need not doubt hear of occasional instances in which individual Jews

¹⁶⁸ Pamphil. *Apolog. pro Orig.* in Routh's *Reliquiae sacrae*, iv. 360. Cyrill, *Cateches.* xii. 17. Also in general, *Orig. ad African.* § 14 (for the passage, see vol. i. p. 173). Vopisc. *Vita Saturnin.* chap. viii. Chr. G. Fr. Walch, *Historia Patriarcharum Judaeorum, quorum in libris juris Romani fit mentio*, Jenae 1752.

¹⁶⁹ Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 12. 1.

^{169a} This appears indirectly, above all, from Joseph. *contra Apion.* ii. 4. For in that passage the historian draws attention to it as being something unusual that the Jews should be in the enjoyment of the rights of citizens in Alexandria, Antioch and the cities of Ionia. Of course the list here given is not complete, for they also enjoyed similar rights in all the towns founded by Seleucus I. Still we can see that it was not usual for Jews to possess them.

have the rights of citizenship conferred upon them. Paul, for instance, who was a citizen of Tarsus (Acts xxi. 39), is a case in point. But, as a rule, the *Jewish communities* in those cities are to be regarded in the light of *private associations of settlers*, which were recognised by the State and on which certain rights were conferred, but the members of which did not enjoy the rights of citizenship and consequently were also debarred from having a voice in the direction of the affairs of the city. Still there was after all a pretty large number of towns in which the Jews enjoyed the *rights of citizenship*. This was true above all of the towns more recently built in the Hellenistic period, and pre-eminently of the foremost amongst them, viz. Antioch and Alexandria, the capitals of the kingdoms of the Seleucidae and the Ptolemies respectively. Seleucus I. Nicator († 280 B.C.) conferred the rights of citizenship upon the Jews living *in all the towns founded by himself* in Asia Minor and Syria,¹⁷⁰ rights which they were all found to be still enjoying in the time of Josephus.¹⁷¹ The most important of these towns was Antioch, where the rights of the Jews were inscribed upon tablets of brass.¹⁷² They also continued to enjoy their rights of citizenship there at a later period, not only under the Seleucidae after Antiochus Epiphanes, but under the Romans as well.¹⁷³ Even in the time of the great Vespasian war Titus declined to accede to the urgent request of the people of Antioch to deprive the Jews of the rights of citizenship by simply appealing to their ancient privileges.¹⁷⁴ In like manner in Alexandria the

¹⁷⁰ For a list of them consult Appian. *Syr.* lvii.

¹⁷¹ Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 3. 1 : Σέλευκος ὁ Νικάτωρ ἐν αἷς ἔκτισε πόλεις ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ καὶ τῇ κάτω Συρίᾳ καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ μητροπόλει Ἀντιοχείᾳ πολιτείας αὐτοὺς ἤξίωσε, καὶ τοῖς ἐνοικισθεῖσιν Ἰσσηρίους ἀπέδειξε Μακεδόσι καὶ Ἑλλήσιν, ὡς τὴν πολιτείαν ταύτην ἔτι καὶ νῦν διαμένειν.

¹⁷² Bell. *Jud.* vii. 5. 2. Comp. in general, besides *Antt.* xii. 3. 1, also *contra Apion.* ii. 4 : αὐτῶν γὰρ ἡμῶν οἱ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν κατοικοῦντες Ἀντιοχεῖ, ὀνομάζονται τὴν γὰρ πολιτείαν αὐτοῖς ἔδωκεν ὁ κτίστης Σέλευκος.

¹⁷³ Bell. *Jud.* vii. 3. 3

¹⁷⁴ Bell. *Jud.* vii. 5. 2 ; *Antt.* xii. 3. 1

Jews obtained citizen rights when the city was founded.¹⁷⁵ Alexander the Great conferred upon them "equal rights with the Macedonians" (who are no other than just the regular citizens of Alexandria), while the Diadochoi granted them permission to call themselves Macedonians.¹⁷⁶ Nor did any change take place with regard to those rights in the time of the Romans. They were expressly confirmed by Julius Caesar, as might be seen from what was inscribed upon a pillar set up in Alexandria, and which was still standing in Josephus' day.¹⁷⁷ It is true that, during the persecution in Caligula's time, the rights of the Alexandrian Jews were trampled under foot. But as soon as Claudius succeeded to the throne he lost no time in guaranteeing the continued existence of Jewish rights.¹⁷⁸ And as in Antioch so here too they were not curtailed in the slightest degree, even after the war of the year 70 of our era.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁵ On the Jewish rights of citizenship in Alexandria, comp. Lumbroso, *Ricerche Alessandrine*, Turin 1871. Löschner in *Comm.* (90 pages large quarto; reprinted from the *Memorie della Reale Accademia delle scienze di Torino*, 2nd series, vol. xxvii.). I am acquainted with this treatise only through the review of it in the *Literar. Centralbl.* 1873, No. 1.

¹⁷⁶ Joseph. *Apion.* ii. 4: Εἰς κατοίκησιν δὲ αὐτοῖς ἔδωκε τόπον Ἀλέξανδρος, καὶ Ἰσῆς παρὰ τοῖς Μακεδόσι τιμῆς ἐπέτυχον. . . . καὶ μέχρι νῦν αὐτῶν ἡ Φυλὴ τὴν προσηγορίαν εἶχε Μακεδόνες. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 7: Ἀλέξανδρος. . . ἔδωκε τὸ μετοικεῖν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν ἐξ ἰσοτιμίας πρὸς Ἕλληνας. Διέμεινε δὲ αὐτοῖς ἡ τιμὴ καὶ παρὰ τῶν διαδόχων, οἳ καὶ τόπον ἴδιον αὐτοῖς ἀφώρισαν, ὅπως καθαρωτέραν ἔχοιεν τὴν δίκαιαν, ἦτον ἐπιμισγομένων τῶν ἀλλοφύλων, καὶ γρηματίζειν ἐπέτρεψαν Μακεδόνας. Ἐπεὶ τε Ῥωμαῖοι κατεστήσαντο τὴν Αἴγυπτον, οὔτε Καῖσαρ ὁ πρῶτος οὔτε τῶν μετ' αὐτόν τι ὑπέμεινε τὰς ἀπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου τιμὰς Ἰουδαίων ἐλαττῶσαι.

¹⁷⁷ *Antt.* xiv. 10. 1: Καῖσαρ Ἰούλιος τοῖς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Ἰουδαίοις ποιήσας χαλκὴν στήλην ἐθήλωσεν ὅτι Ἀλεξανδρέων πολῖται εἰσίν. *Apion.* ii. 4: τὴν στήλην τὴν ἐστῶσαν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα περιέχουσαν ὁ Καῖσαρ ὁ μέγας τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἔδωκεν.

¹⁷⁸ *Antt.* xix. 5. 2 (with a glance back at the history of the citizen rights of the Jews of Alexandria).

¹⁷⁹ *Antt.* xii. 3. 1: κρατήσαντος Οὔεσπασιανοῦ καὶ Τίτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης, δεσθίνοντες οἱ Ἀλεξανδρεῖς καὶ Ἀντιοχεῖς ἵνα τὰ δίκαια τῆς

Nor did the Jews enjoy the rights of citizenship merely in the towns newly founded in the Hellenistic period, but also in those on the *coast of Ionia* as well, and above all in Ephesus, in which towns those rights had been conferred upon them by Antiochus II. Theos (261–246 B.C.). When, in the time of Augustus, the municipal authorities in that quarter petitioned that the Jews should either be excluded from the enjoyment of the rights of citizenship, or be compelled to renounce their separate worship and conform to that of the native divinities, Agrippa, who happened to have the administration of the eastern provinces, maintained intact the ancient privileges of the Jews, whose interests on this occasion were represented by Nicolaus Damascenus, deputed to do so by Herod (in the year 14 B.C.).¹⁸⁰ We learn incidentally that the Jews also possessed the rights of citizenship in Sardes¹⁸¹ for example, and not less so outside of Asia Minor as in the case of Cyrene.¹⁸²

The position thus created for the Jews in consequence of possessing all those privileges was one involving an *internal contradiction*. On the one hand, they formed when living in

πολιτείας μηκέτι μένη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, οὐκ ἐπίτυχον. Lumbroso (in the dissertation already referred to) expresses the opinion that Ptolemy IV. (Philopater) created a new order of citizen rights in Alexandria, which found its expression in the worship of Bacchus. Now, as the Jews were not at liberty to join in this worship they were excluded from this new order of citizen rights, and only retained the former designation of Macedonians though it had lost its original value. But it may be proved from what is said over and over again by Josephus, that no change whatever took place with regard to the political status of the Jews of Alexandria from the time of Alexander the Great till that of Vespasian; while the third Book of Maccabees, on which Lumbroso founds, is as a rule hardly to be appealed to as historical testimony.

¹⁸⁰ *Antt.* xii. 3. 2. *Apion.* ii. 4: οἱ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην Ἰωνίαν τοῖς αὐθιγενέσι πολίταις ὁμωνυμοῦσι, τοῦτο παρασχόντων αὐτοῖς τῶν διαδόχων. On the negotiations of the year 14 B.C., see besides *Antt.* xii. 3. 2. also *Antt.* xvi. 2. 3–5, and note 139, above.

¹⁸¹ *Antt.* xiv. 10. 24.

¹⁸² *Antt.* xvi. 6. 1. Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, i. 1881, p. 463.

Gentile cities a community of foreigners who, for the furtherance of their religious concerns, had organized themselves into an independent body, and whose religious views were hopelessly at variance with every species of Gentile worship. And yet, on the other, they participated as citizens in all the rights and duties of municipal life, they had seats and the right of voting in the civic councils, and had a share in the direction of the affairs of the city. This must of necessity have led to incessant collision. For the idea of separating religious from political concerns was, so long as it remained true to itself, altogether foreign to classical antiquity; it looked upon the worship of the native divinities as also forming an essential part of the public affairs of the city. And so how it must have been felt to be a standing contradiction to see in the very heart of the municipality, and enjoying all the rights of citizenship, a body of people who not only persisted in worshipping their own God alongside those of the city, but who assailed every form of Gentile worship whatever as an abomination. *Such a thing as the toleration of various worships alongside of each other was really possible only within the cosmopolitan circle of the Roman Empire.* For there was realized in all its fulness the fundamental thought for which Hellenism paved the way, that every man is free to be happy after his own fashion. Consequently there was room here for Jews as well. In the municipal towns, on the other hand, which clung to the ancient modes of life in matters of religion as well, the Jews must have been felt to be a continual thorn in the sides of their fellow-citizens. It is therefore not to be wondered at—rather should we say that it entirely accords with the historical development of things, that the Jews should have been persecuted by the municipal towns, whereas the higher authority of the Roman Empire took them under its wing. In those towns there were outbursts of hatred against the

Jews on every occasion, and that above all in those of them in which they enjoyed the rights of citizenship, such as Alexandria, Antioch, many of the towns of Asia Minor, and also Caesarea in Palestine where the *ἰσοπολιτεία* was conferred upon Jews and Gentiles by Herod the Great.¹⁸³ One of the principal accusations against the Jews on those occasions was precisely this, that they refused to worship the gods of the city.¹⁸⁴ But the Roman authorities always came to the rescue and safeguarded the religious freedom of the Jews in so far as these latter did not themselves forfeit their rights by showing revolutionary tendencies. It is well worth noting how, in the address in which Nicolaus Damascenus pleads for the rights of the Jews being respected, it is pointed out

¹⁸³ In Alexandria Jews and Gentiles lived in a state of constant feud ever since the city was founded (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 7); and in Caligula's time it was here above all that the Gentile portion of the populace persecuted the Jews before the emperor himself had begun to oppress them (Philo, *adv. Flaccum*). In Vespasian's time the Alexandrians besieged the emperor with petitions to get him to deprive their Jewish fellow-citizens of their rights (*Antt.* xii. 3. 1). In Antioch it got the length of bloodshed in Vespasian's time (*Bell. Jud.* vii. 3. 3), while Titus again was asked to expel the Jews from the city altogether, and if he could not see his way to do this, then to deprive them of their rights at least (*Bell. Jud.* vii. 5. 2; *Antt.* xii. 3. 1). In Asia Minor the municipal towns were always making fresh attempts to prevent the Jews from practising their own worship, which was precisely the reason that the Roman edicts of toleration became necessary (*Antt.* xii. 3. 2, xvi. 2. 3-5, and in general the edicts given in *Antt.* xiv. 10 and xvi. 6). The same thing also took place in Cyrene (*Antt.* xvi. 6. 1 and 5). In Caesarea it often got the length of sanguinary encounters between Gentiles and Jews (*Antt.* xx. 8. 7, 9; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13. 7, 14. 4-5, 18. 1). In like manner in towns where Jews did not enjoy the rights of citizenship the hatred of the Gentile populace occasionally vented itself upon them in the shape of bloody persecution, as was pre-eminently the case at the outbreak of the Jewish war in Ascalon, Ptolemais, Tyre, Hippos, Gadara (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 5) and Damascus (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 2). With regard to the people of Ascalon, Philo observes that they had an inveterate dislike to the Jews (Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 30, ed. Mang. ii. 576). Of the Phoenicians it was, according to Josephus, the Tyrians who were specially animated by feelings of hostility toward the Jews (*contra Apion.* i. 13).

¹⁸⁴ *Antt.* xii. 3. 2.

as something quite new, as a boon which the Romans, with their orderly system of government, were the first to create, viz. that everywhere every one was at liberty "to live and worship his own gods."¹⁸⁵

The more that the attitude of the Romans, with their world-wide power, was on the whole favourable to Judaism, it was of but the greater consequence to the Jews of the dispersion that so many of them possessed the *rights of Roman citizenship*, not only in Rome, but elsewhere as well. According to the testimony of Philo, the majority of the Jews living in Rome enjoyed such rights, and that in the capacity of descendants of freedmen. Of the Jews taken captive in war, and whom Pompey had once brought to Rome and there sold as slaves, many were set free by their own master, and on obtaining their freedom they were at the same time invested with the rights of citizenship, which rights their descendants continued to enjoy ever after.¹⁸⁶ It would even appear that some of those *libertini* must have quitted Rome and gone back to Jerusalem again, where they had founded a community by themselves. For the *Λιβερτῖνοι* mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles (vi. 9) can hardly have been other than Roman freedmen and their descendants.¹⁸⁷ Consequently

¹⁸⁵ *Antt.* xvi. 2. 4 (ed Bekker, vol. iv. p. 6): ἐξεῖναι κατὰ χώραν ἐκάστοις τὰ οἰκεία τιμῶσιν ἄγειν καὶ διαζῆν.

¹⁸⁶ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23 (Mang. ii. 568 sq.): 'Ρωμαῖοι δὲ ἦσαν οἱ πλείους ἀπελευθερωθέντες. Αἰχμάλωτοι γὰρ ἀχθέντες εἰς Ἰταλίαν ὑπὸ τῶν κτησαμένων ἠλευθερώθησαν, οὐδὲν τῶν πατρίων παραχαράζαι βιασθέντες. . . Ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν (scil. Augustus) οὔτε ἐξόκισε τῆς Ῥώμης ἐκείνους, οὔτε τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς αὐτῶν ἀφείλετο πολιτείαν. The act of manumission might take place in different ways. When it was performed in the formal solemn fashion the slave received along with his freedom the rights of Roman citizenship. See Rein in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iv. 1026 ff. (art. "Libertini").

¹⁸⁷ A *libertinus* is either the son of a freedman or a freedman himself (see Rein as above). But the community at Jerusalem founded by such *libertini* seems to have still retained its designation of συναγωγή Λιβερτίνων among the later generations as well. Comp. in general the commentaries on Acts vi. 9 (the matter being treated with great detail for example in

there would be Jews living in Jerusalem too who possessed the rights of Roman citizenship. But we also find such in large numbers elsewhere, and above all in Asia Minor.¹⁸⁸ Hence there is nothing at all strange in the circumstance that the Apostle Paul, a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, was found to be in the enjoyment of the rights of Roman citizenship (Acts xvi. 37 sqq., xxii. 25–29, xxiii. 27).¹⁸⁹ It is true we have no means of knowing how the Jews of Asia Minor attained to this position.¹⁹⁰ But the fact itself is all the less open to question, that it is well known otherwise that as early as the first century B.C. there were many thousands of Roman citizens living in Asia Minor.¹⁹¹ The *advantages* that accompanied the

Jo. Chrph. Wolf's *Curæ phil. in Nov. Test.* i. 1090–93, with a list of the earlier literature; also Deyling, *Observationes Sacrae*, ii. 437–444), and the Bible lexicons of Winer, Schenkel and Riehm under “Libertiner.”

¹⁸⁸ So in Ephesus (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 13, 16, 19), Sardes (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 17), Delos (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 14), and generally, *Antt.* xiv. 10. 18.

¹⁸⁹ Doubts as to Paul's enjoyment of such rights have been raised for example by Renan (*Paulus*, chap. xiii. of German edition 1869, p. 442) and Overbeck (*Erklärung der Apostelgesch.* pp. 266 sq., 429 sq.). But the reasons advanced in support of those doubts appear to me much too weak in presence of the fact that it is precisely in the most trustworthy portions of the Acts that the matter is vouched for.

¹⁹⁰ For a conjecture as to this see Mendelssohn in *Acta soc. philol.*, Lips. v. 174–176. On the various ways generally in which the rights of Roman citizenship might be acquired, see Rein, art. “Civitas,” in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* ii. 392 sqq. Winer, *Realwörterb.* i. 200, art. “Bürgerrecht.” On the special question as to how Paul became a Roman citizen, see the literature given in Wolf's *Curæ phil. in Nov. Test.*, note on Acts xxii. 28. De Wette, *Einl. in das N. T.* § 119b. Credner, *Einl. in das N. T.* p. 288 sq. Winer's *Realwörterb.* i. 200, ii. 212. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften N. T.'s*, § 58. Wieseler, *Chronol. des apostol. Zeitalters*, p. 61 sqq. Wold. Schmidt in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xi. 357.

¹⁹¹ There is the well-known fact of the massacre perpetrated by *Mithridates*, who in the year 88 B.C. ordered all the Roman citizens in Asia Minor to be put to death with their wives and children (see the passages for example in Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerl. Verfassung des röm. Reichs*, i. 25). Valerius Maximus estimates the number of the massacred at 80,000 (Valer. Max. ix. 2, *extern.* iii. : Tam hercule quam Mithridatem regem, qui una epistola lxxx. civium Romanorum in Asia per urbes negotiandi gratia dispersa interemit). Of course here it would seem to be natives of Italy

possession of the rights of Roman citizenship were very considerable. For those living in the provinces it was of consequence above all that a Roman was subject only to the jurisdiction of Roman courts, the civil causes being disposed of by a jury composed of Roman citizens,¹⁹² and those of a criminal character by the Roman procurator or governor. It was only in the *civitates*, recognised as *liberae*, that the Roman citizens as well were subject to the jurisdiction of other than Roman authorities.¹⁹³ Of the various privileges¹⁹⁴ the following may be further mentioned as worthy of special note: (1) Exemption from every kind of degrading punishment, such for example as scourging and crucifixion;¹⁹⁵ and (2) the *jus provocationis* or *appellationis*, both which phrases were used synonymously in the imperial age, and were employed to denote the right of appealing against any sentence to the emperor himself. This right held good in the case of civil as well as criminal causes.¹⁹⁶ We must beware of confounding with this appeal against a sentence *already pronounced* the claim that might be put in at the very commencement of the process to have the whole matter referred to the emperor in Rome. According to the usual though

that are in question. But we find scarcely forty years after this that the number of Roman citizens in Asia Minor was so large that the consul Lentulus was able in the year 49 B.C. to raise as many as two legions of them (Caesar, *Bell. Civ.* iii. 4; for the passage, see note 144, above). Certainly in this instance it can hardly be only natives of Italy that are in view.

¹⁹² Rudorff, *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, ii. 13.

¹⁹³ Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerl. Verfassung des römischen Reichs*, ii. 24. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. 1881, p. 75 sq.

¹⁹⁴ On these see Rein, art. "Civitas," in Pauly's *Encycl.* ii. 392 sqq. Winer, *Realwörterb.* i. 200, art. "Bürgerrecht," and the literature quoted by both.

¹⁹⁵ See Acts xvi. 37 sqq., xxii. 25 sqq., and Pauly's *Real-Enc.* under "Crux," "Lex Porcia" and "Lex Sempronia."

¹⁹⁶ See Rein in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* under "Appellatio" and "Provocatio." Geib, *Geschichte des römischen Criminalprocesses* (1842), p. 675 sqq.

not altogether indisputable view, Roman citizens charged with capital offences were also at liberty to urge this claim.¹⁹⁷

In many Hellenistic cities the Jews, in virtue of their possessing the rights of citizenship, were on a level with the rest of the inhabitants. Of course in those communes they failed on an average to attain to a leading position. We should rather say that, as we have already seen, it was precisely this possessing of the rights of citizenship that led to the hostility and persecution to which they were so often exposed. At the same time there were many places, Egypt in particular, where at certain periods Jews also have been found to play a *prominent part in public life*. The first of the Ptolemies were on the whole favourably disposed toward them.¹⁹⁸ Under some of the later Ptolemies again very important appointments were entrusted to them. Ptolemy VI. (Philopater) and his consort Cleopatra "committed the care of their entire kingdom to the hands of Jews, while it was the Jewish generals Onias and Dositheus that had command of the whole army."¹⁹⁹ Another Cleopatra, the daughter of the two royal personages just mentioned, when carrying on war against her son Ptolemy Lathurus, also appointed two Jewish generals, Chelkias and Ananias, to the

¹⁹⁷ Acts xxv. 10 sqq., 21, xxvi. 32. Pliny, *Epist.* x. 96 (*al.* 97): *Fuerunt alii similis amentiae, quos quia cives Romani erant adnotavi in urbem remittendos.* Geib, *Gesch. des röm. Criminalprocesses*, p. 251. Wieseler, *Chronol. des apostol. Zeitalters*, p. 383 sqq. (who however confounds the claim put in by Paul with the *appellatio* proper). Overbeck, *Erklärung der Apostelgesch.* p. 429 sq. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, ii. 1 (1874), p. 245. That Roman citizens could *insist* on the procedure in question as a *right* is not perfectly certain. See, on the other hand, a monograph of Ruprechts just published.

¹⁹⁸ Joseph. *Apion.* ii. 4.

¹⁹⁹ *Apion.* ii. 5: 'Ο δὲ Φιλομήτωρ Πτολεμαῖος καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Κλεοπάτρα τὴν βασιλείαν ὅλην τὴν ἑαυτῶν Ἰουδαίους ἐπιστεύσαν, καὶ στρατηγοὶ πάσης τῆς δυνάμεως ἦσαν Ὀνίας καὶ Δοσίθεος Ἰουδαῖοι.

chief command of her army.²⁰⁰ Likewise in the Roman period many wealthy Jews were still found to be playing a prominent part in public life in Alexandria. In particular we happen to know that the office of *alabarch*, probably chief collector of customs on the Arabian side of the Nile, was repeatedly held by wealthy Jews, as for example by Alexander the brother of Philo the Philosopher, and later on by a certain person called Demetrius.²⁰¹ With reference to this Josephus informs us that the Romans had allowed the Jews of Alexandria "to retain the responsible position that had been entrusted to them by the kings, namely the duty of watching

²⁰⁰ *Antt.* xiii. 10. 4, xiii. 1-2. Chelkias and Ananias were sons of the high priest Onias IV., who built the temple at Leontopolis.

²⁰¹ Alexander the brother of Philo, *Antt.* xviii. 6. 3, 8. 1, xix. 5. 1, xx. 5. 2. Demetrius, *Antt.* xx. 7. 3. On the office of alabarch, comp. my article in the *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1875, pp. 13-40, where the earlier literature is also given. Since that was written there fall to be added to the list, Grätz, *Die jüdischen Ethnarchen oder Alabarchen in Alexandria* (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1876, pp. 209 sqq., 241 sqq., 308 sqq.), who, while in essential points accepting my results, has nevertheless overlaid them with all manner of confusions. As the two alabarchs mentioned by Josephus happen to have been wealthy Jews, many have supposed the alabarch to have been the president of the whole Jewish community in Alexandria, and have therefore identified him with the Jewish ethnarch. But there is not the slightest warrant for this. I rather incline to think that I have shown to a demonstration that the ἀλαβάρχης (*Edict. Just.* xi. 2-3; Palladas, *Anthol. graec.*, ed. Jacobs, vol. iii. p. 121; *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4267; a coin in Mionnet's *Description de médailles antiques*, Suppl. vol. vi. p. 379) is identical with the ἀπαβάρχης (*Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4751, 5075; *Cod. Just.* iv. 61. 9; Cicero, *ad Atticum*, ii. 17; Juvenal, i. 130), and is the designation given to the chief collector of customs on the Arabian side of the Nile. See in particular *Cod. Just.* iv. 61. 9 (edict of the Emperors Gratian, Valentinian and Theodosius): Usurpationem totius licentiae summovemus circa vectigal Arabarchiae per Aegyptum atque Augustamnica constitutum, nihilque super transductionem animalium, quae sine praebitione solita minime permittenda est, temeritate per licentiam vindicari concedimus. The only difficulty in the way is that with regard to the inscription 4267 of *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* found in Lycia; and the coin of Teos (which I have not taken account of in my article). But in both instances the title may have been imported from Egypt.

the river.”²⁰² There was a distinguished Alexandrian Jew of the name of Tiberius Alexander, a son of Alexander the alabarch just mentioned, who even rose to some of the highest positions in the Roman army, though at the sacrifice of the religion of his fathers.²⁰³ No doubt the Jews had grown to be an influential element in society even in Rome itself. But here they never succeeded in gaining the position they had attained in Egypt, the contrast between the Roman and Jewish natures being too strong and abrupt for that.²⁰⁴

4. *Their Religious Life.*

The constant contact of the Judaism of the dispersion with Gentile culture could not fail to influence its internal development as well. Above all, in those places where, from their wealth and social standing, the Jews were in a position to avail themselves of the educative agencies of their time—as in Alexandria in particular—did the Judaism of the dispersion follow a direction essentially different from that of Palestine. In the dispersion the cultured Jew was not only a Jew, but a Greek as well, alike in respect of language,

²⁰² *Apion*. ii. 5, *fin.*: Maximam vero eis fidem olim a regibus datam conservare voluerunt, id est fluminis custodiam totiusque custodiae, nequaquam his rebus indignos esse judicantes. The words *totiusque custodiae* are in any case a corruption. Perhaps instead of *custodiae* (= Φυλακῆς) we should read θαλάσσης. By *custodia* we are naturally to understand the watching with a view to the collecting of the customs. Comp. Caesar, *Bell. Alexandr.* c. xiii.: Erant omnibus ostiis Nili custodiae exigendi portorii causa dispositae. Naves veteres erant in occultis regiae navalibus, quibus multis annis ad navigandum non erant usi.

²⁰³ *Antt.* xx. 5. 2: τοῖς γὰρ πατριοῖς οὐκ ἐνέμεινεν οὗτος ἔθελαι. On Tiberius Alexander, comp. § 19, above.

²⁰⁴ Perhaps we may be allowed only further to add, that among the Jews who were crucified by Florus in Jerusalem in the year 66 A.D. there were also some who held the rank of Roman knighthood (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 9). Their execution is justly described by Josephus as a serious violation of their rights.

education, and habits, and by the sheer force of circumstances he was impelled to find ways and means of harmonizing and combining Jewish and Hellenistic idiosyncrasies (for more on this point see § 33 and 34). But strictly speaking this can only be said with regard to the more highly educated among them, while even in their case it was always the original Jewish element of their character that predominated. This latter was true, in a still higher degree, of the great mass of the Jewish people. However much those of the dispersion may have adopted the Greek language as their vernacular, however defective and lax their observance of the law might have seemed in the eyes of the Pharisees, however much they may have given up as unimportant what to the Pharisee appeared both essential and necessary, still in the depths of their heart they were Jews notwithstanding, and felt themselves to be in all essential respects in unison with their brethren in Palestine.

One of the principal means employed for preserving and upholding the faith of their fathers among the communities of the dispersion was the regular meetings for worship in the *synagogues* on the Sabbath. There cannot be a doubt that in the dispersion as well those meetings took place wherever an organized community of Jews was found to exist. We learn from Philo that "in all the towns thousands of houses of instruction were open where discernment and moderation and skill and justice and all virtues generally were taught."²⁰⁵ In the course of his travels through Asia Minor and Greece the Apostle Paul everywhere met with Jewish synagogues; as for example in Antioch of Pisidia (Acts xiii. 14), Iconium (Acts xiv. 1), Ephesus (xviii. 19, 26, xix. 8), Thessalonica (xvii. 1), Berea (xvii. 10), Athens (xvii. 17), Corinth (xviii. 4, 7). Josephus mentions synagogues as being

²⁰⁵ Philo, *De septenario*, c. vi. (Mang. ii. 282=Tischendorf, *Philonea*, p. 23). For the passage itself, see note 113. § 27. above.

in Caesarea and Dora on the Phoenician coast.²⁰⁶ Jewish *προσευχαί* are met with even upon inscriptions in the Crimea.²⁰⁷ Then in those towns in which the Jews were rather more numerous there were several synagogues. This was so in the case of Damascus (Acts ix. 20), of Salamis in Cyprus (Acts xiii. 5), while in Alexandria there was quite a multitude of them.²⁰⁸ Josephus singles out as being particularly elegant the synagogue at Antioch (*i.e.* the chief synagogue there, for in any case there was a considerable number of them in that town as well). To this latter the successors of Antiochus Epiphanes had presented the sacred vessels of brass (and these alone, not the valuable gold and silver ones) which Antiochus had carried off from the temple at Jerusalem, while the Jews of Antioch themselves were at the expense of providing cups of a more valuable kind in order still more to enhance the beauty of their sanctuary (*τὸ ἱερόν*).²⁰⁹ In Rome there was a large number of synagogues as early as the time of Augustus, as Philo testifies throughout his works generally. Further, the names of the various synagogal communities have been handed down to us through the medium of the inscriptions.²¹⁰ Consequently wherever Jews were found to be living, there the law and the prophets were read and expounded every Sabbath and the religious ordinances observed. *The language employed in public worship was, as a rule, undoubtedly the Greek.*²¹¹ The truth is Hebrew was so little current among

²⁰⁶ Caesarea, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 4-5. Dora, *Antt.* xix. 6. 3.

²⁰⁷ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. ii. p. 1004 sq. *Addenda*, n. 2114b, 2114bb.

²⁰⁸ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 20 (*Mang.* ii. 565): πολλοὶ δὲ εἰσι καὶ ἑκάστον τιμῆμα τῆς πόλεως.

²⁰⁹ *Bell. Jud.* vii. 3. 3.

²¹⁰ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23 (*Mang.* ii. 568 sq.). For the passage itself, see note 133, above. On the various names of the synagogal communities of Rome, see above, p. 247 sq.

²¹¹ On this and as partly *pro* and partly *contra*, comp. Lightfoot, *Horae hebr. in Epis. I. ad Corinthios*, *Addenda ad Cap.* xiv. (*Opp.* ii. 933-940; he questions the use of the Septuagint in the public services). Hody, *De*

the Jews of the dispersion that not a single instance has been met with of its use upon a tombstone. At all events the inscriptions in the Roman catacombs (dating from the first centuries of our era) are composed almost exclusively in Greek or Latin (the latter less frequently), or at most with short postscripts in Hebrew. It is not till we come down to the epitaphs of Venosa (dating from somewhere about the sixth century of our era) that we see how Hebrew begins to come gradually into use.²¹² But among these too it is Greek or Latin that is still most frequently met with. If even for such monumental purposes Hebrew was not in use, then much less likely is it to have been so in the oral addresses at the meetings for public worship. The Rabbinical authorities in Palestine have expressly sanctioned the use of any language whatever in repeating the Shemah, the Shemoneh Esreh, and the grace at meals; while it is only in the case of the priestly benediction, and a few special passages of Scripture, such as the formula repeated in connection with the offering of the firstlings and with the chaliza that the use of Hebrew is absolutely insisted upon.²¹³ A certain R. Levi bar Chaitha once heard the Shemah repeated in Greek (אַלִּינִסְתָּן) in Caesarea.²¹⁴ Then the *writing* of the Holy Scriptures in Greek is expressly sanctioned, while here too, as before, it is only in the case of several passages composed for certain specific purposes, such as the tephillin and mesusoth, that the

Bibliorum textibus originalibus, pp. 224–228 (in answer to Lightfoot). Diodati, *De Christo graece loquente* (Neapoli 1767), pp. 108–110. Waehner, *Antiquitates Ebraeorum*, i. § 253. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. 56 sqq. Caspari, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, iii. p. 269 sq.

²¹² This is a circumstance to which Askoli in particular (*Inscrizioni inedite*, 1880) has drawn attention. Comp. my review in the *Theol. Litztg.* 1880, p. 485 sq.

²¹³ *Mishna Sota*, vii. 1. 2. Comp. vol. i. p. 10.

²¹⁴ *Jer. Sota*, vii. fol. 21b. See the passage for example in Buxtorf's *Lex. Chald.* col. 104 (under אַלִּינִסְתָּן). Lightfoot, *Opp.* ii. 937. Levy *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* i. 88.

use of Hebrew is insisted on.²¹⁵ If therefore, in oral address or written compositions, the use of Hebrew was obligatory only in the case of certain passages, then one should say that, according to the Rabbinical view, it must also have been considered legitimate to read the Scriptures at the meetings for public worship in some other language, say in Greek. But several of the Fathers have distinctly assured us that, as matter of fact, it was the Greek translation of the Bible that was used in the synagogues, and therefore during public worship.²¹⁶ At the same time it is quite possible that on such occasions the Scriptures were read in Hebrew as well as in Greek, as was subsequently the case in the time of the Emperor Justinian.²¹⁷ But if we reflect how the Apostle Paul for example was familiar only with the Greek translation of the Old Testament,²¹⁸ we can hardly suppose it probable that

²¹⁵ *Megilla* i. 8: "Between the Holy Scriptures and the tephillin or mesusoth the only difference is this, that the former may be written in any language, whereas the tephillin and mesusoth must be written in Assyrian (אשורית, i.e. in Hebrew square characters). Rabban Simon ben Gamaliel says: likewise the Holy Scriptures are allowed to be written only in Greek."

²¹⁶ Justin. *Apolog.* i. 31: ἔμειναν αἱ βίβλοι καὶ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις μέχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, καὶ πανταχοῦ παρὰ πᾶσιν εἰσιν Ἰουδαίους, οἳ καὶ ἀναγινώσκοντες οὐ συνιᾶσι τὰ εἰρημένα. Comp. also *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. lxxii. Tertullian, *Apologet.* c. xviii.: Hodie apud Serapeum Ptolemaei bibliothecae cum ipsis Hebraicis litteris exhibentur. Sed et Judaei palam lectitant. Vectigalis libertas; vulgo aditur sabbatis omnibus. Pseudo-Justin. *Cohort. ad Graec.* (third century A.D.) c. xiii.: Εἰ δὲ τις φάσκει . . . μὴ ἡμῖν τὰς βίβλους ταύτας ἀλλὰ Ἰουδαίοις προσήκειν, διὰ τὸ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν σόζεσθαι κ.τ.λ. *Ibid.*: ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων συναγωγῆς ταύτας ἀξιούμεν προκομίζεσθαι. In all those passages the Greek translation of the Old Testament is expressly referred to. On the keeping of the Holy Scriptures in safe custody in the synagogues, see above, p. 74 sq.

²¹⁷ Justinian, *Novell.* cxlvi., where the emperor states in the preamble that he has heard ὡς οἱ μὲν μόνης ἔχονται τῆς ἑβραϊδος φωνῆς καὶ αὐτῇ κεκρῆσθαι περὶ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν βιβλίων ἀνάγνωσιν βούλονται, οἱ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἑλληνίδα προσλαμβάνειν ἀξιούσι, καὶ πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον ὑπὲρ τούτου πρὸς σφᾶς αὐτοῦ, στασιαζουσιν.

²¹⁸ This has been demonstrated by Kautzsch, *De Veteris Testamenti locis a Paulo apostolo allegatis*, Lips. 1869.

there was any such simultaneous use of both the Hebrew and the Greek text.

Considering how rigidly Jewish worship was centralized in Jerusalem, the existence of *the Jewish temple at Leontopolis* cannot but strike us as a somewhat remarkable phenomenon. In the time of Antiochus V. Eupater (164–162 B.C.), Onias IV., the son of the high priest Onias III., finding that there was no prospect of his succeeding to the high-priesthood in Palestine, came to Egypt where he was cordially welcomed by Ptolemy VI. Philometer and his consort Cleopatra. The king placed at his disposal in Leontopolis in the province of Heliopolis a dilapidated temple which had previously been dedicated to the *ἁγία Βούβαστις*.²¹⁹ This ruin Onias proceeded to

²¹⁹ The locality is most minutely defined in *Antt.* xiii. 3. 2: τὸ ἐν Λεοντοπόλει τοῦ Ἡλιοπολίτου ἱερὸν συμπεπτακός . . . προσαγορευόμενον δὲ τῆς ἁγίας Βουβάστωος. A similar precise fixing of the spot may be found in what is said *Antt.* xiii. 3. 1. Everywhere else Josephus merely mentions in a general way that the temple stood “in the province of Heliopolis” (*Antt.* xii. 9. 7, xiii. 10. 4, xx. 10; *Bell. Jud.* i. 1. 1, vii. 10. 3). In one passage only is it further added that the place on which it stood was 180 stadia from Memphis (*Bell. Jud.* vii. 10. 3). Now as we know from other sources that Leontopolis formed a province of itself lying more to the north than Heliopolis (Strabo, xvii. 1. 19, p. 802; Pliny, v. 9. 49; Ptolemaeus, iv. 5. 51), it follows that the Leontopolis here spoken of must be another one otherwise unknown to us and lying in the province of Heliopolis. As affording a clue towards a precise identifying of the spot, the following facts may be subjoined. Memphis stood on the southern point of the Delta. To the north of it some 24 miles off and on the eastern side of the Delta lay Heliopolis (see *Itinerar. Antonini*, ed. Parthey et Pinder, 1848, p. 73). The distance as here stated corresponds pretty closely with the 180 stadia=22½ miles given by Josephus. But the *Itinerarium Antonini* again mentions a place called *Vicus Judaeorum* at a distance of 22+12=34 miles to the north-east of Heliopolis (*Itinerar. Antonini*, ed. Parthey et Pinder, p. 75; the distances as given at p. 73 are somewhat greater; on the situation of the place, see Menke, *Atlas antiquus*, map xxx.). One is tempted to identify the place here in question with the site of Onias’ temple, for it may easily enough have belonged to the province of Heliopolis; besides this identification is further favoured by the circumstance of the province of Bubastus being near by. But as this *Vicus Judaeorum* was as far as 24+34=58 miles (therefore 464 stadia) from Memphis, we are bound to assume that Josephus must have been expressing himself in

rebuild, and transformed it into a Jewish sanctuary after the model of the temple in Jerusalem, though smaller and plainer and with numerous deviations in regard to details. Now as there also happened to be a sufficient number of priests already at hand a regular Jewish temple service was at once instituted, a service which continued without interruption from that date (therefore from somewhere about 160 B.C.) till the destruction of Jerusalem, after which, like its prototype, it was closed by the Romans (73 A.D.).²²⁰ Of course the learned doctors of Palestine

very vague terms, and that his 180 stadia were not meant to represent the distance between Memphis and the temple of Onias, but merely that between Memphis and the capital of the province of Heliopolis (the passage as it occurs in *Bell. Jud.* vii. 10. 3 runs thus: δίδωσιν αὐτῷ χώραν ἑκατὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀγδοήκοντα σταδίοις ἀπέχουσαν Μέμφεως· νομὸς δ' οὗτος Ἑλίουπολῖτις καλεῖται). The "land of Onias" (ἡ Ὀνίου λεγομένη χώρα), which was inhabited by Jews, is likewise mentioned in *Antt.* xiv. 8. 1 = *Bell. Jud.* i. 9. 4, and that as lying between Pelusium and Memphis, which accords with the foregoing statements. Different from this again is the "so-called camp of the Jews," τὸ καλούμενον Ἰουδαίων στρατόπεδον, *Antt.* xiv. 8. 2 = *Bell. Jud.* i. 9. 4, on the other side of the Delta and to the north-west of Memphis (the army of Mithridates and Antipater in hastening to the assistance of Caesar marched from Pelusium through the "land of Onias" on to Memphis and thence round the Delta to the "Jews' camp"). Lastly, in the *Notitia Dignitatum Orientis*, chap. xxv. (ed. Böcking, i. 69), a *Castra Judaeorum* is mentioned as being in the province of Augustamnica. Now as Augustamnica is the land to the east of the Delta (see my article on the alabarchs in the *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1875, pp. 26-28), this *Castra Judaeorum* must therefore be identical with the *Vicus Judaeorum*. Comp. in general, Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iv. 354 (article "Judaeorum Vicus"), where however the *Judaeorum Vicus* is erroneously represented as standing to the south-east instead of to the north-east of Heliopolis.

²²⁰ See in general, Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 9. 7, xiii. 3. 1-3, 10. 4, xx. 10; *Bell. Jud.* i. 1. 1, vii. 10. 2-4. Cassel, *De templo Oniae Heliopolitano*, Brem. 1730 (also in *Dissertationum variorum de antiquitatibus sacris et profanis fasciculus novus*, ed. Schlaeger, 1743, pp. 1-48). Herzfeld, iii. pp. 460 sqq., 557-564. Jost, i. pp. 116-120. Grätz, iii. 3rd ed. p. 33 sq. Ewald, iv. p. 462 sqq. Wieseler, *Chronol. des apostol. Zeitalters*, p. 498 sqq. *Untersuchung über den Hebräerbrief*, ii. 75 sqq. *Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, p. 665 sqq. Frankel, *Einiges zur Forschung über den Onias-Tempel* (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1851-52, pp. 273-277). Jastrow, *Einiges über den Hohenpriester Onias IV. in Aegypten und die Gründung des tempels zu Heliopolis* (*Monatsschr.* 1872, pp. 150-155). Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, pp.

never looked upon the services of this temple as legitimate worship, nor did they recognise the sacrifices offered in it as valid except to a very limited extent.²²¹ But even the Egyptian Jews themselves were not satisfied merely with the worship in their adopted country, but still kept up their connection with Jerusalem. In common with all other Jews they made pilgrimages to Jerusalem,²²² while their priests on getting married always had their wife's pedigree authenticated in the Holy City.²²³

In common with the law generally, the prescriptions regarding the temple tribute and the pilgrimages to Jerusalem on festival occasions were as far as possible complied with by the Jews of the dispersion. This was particularly the case with respect to the *tribute*. Apropos of the plundering of the temple by Crassus, Josephus remarks that it was not to be wondered at that such a large amount of treasure should have accumulated there, for from an early date

82-86. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.'s*, § 488. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* part ii. art. "Oniastempel."

²²¹ Mishna, *Menachoth* xiii. 10: "When any one vows to offer a burnt-offering, he must offer it in the temple. If he did so in the temple of Onias he would not fulfil his duty. If he said: I wish to offer it in the temple of Onias, he is bound nevertheless to offer it in the temple. But if he did so in the temple of Onias, still he would fulfil his duty. R. Simon says that would not be in the least a burnt-offering. If any one vows to be a Nazarite he must shave off his hair in the temple, and if he were to do it in the temple of Onias he would not be fulfilling his duty. If he made the vow on the condition that the shaving of the hair was to take place in the temple of Onias, he is nevertheless bound to have it done in that temple. But if he did it in the temple of Onias it would be sufficient. R. Simon: he would not be a Nazarite. The priests who have ministered in the temple of Onias are not at liberty to minister in the temple at Jerusalem. . . . They are like those with some bodily defect; they get their portions and partake of the offerings, but they are not to be allowed to sacrifice." In the common printed text the name of *Onias* is written חוניי (*Chonjo*). Two of the best authorities, *cod. de Rossi* 138, and the Cambridge manuscript edited by Lowe, 1883, uniformly read instead נחונין (*Nechonjon*).

²²² Philo, *De providentia*, quoted by Euseb. in *Praep. evang.* viii. 16. 64, ed. Gaisford (= *Philonis Opp.* ed. Mang. ii. 646); and in Armenian in Aucher's *Philonis Judaei sermones tres*, p. 116.

²²³ *Apion.* i. 7.

every Jew and every proselyte throughout the world, in Europe and Asia alike, had been paying tribute to the temple.²²⁴ Philo gives us the following details as to the way in which the temple tribute was collected and remitted to Jerusalem:²²⁵ "The revenue of the temple is derived not merely from a few lands, but from other and much more copious sources which can never be destroyed. Because as long as the human race endures so long will the sources of the temple revenue continue to exist, seeing that they will last as long as the world itself. For it is prescribed that every Jew who is over twenty years of age is to pay so much tribute annually. . . . But as might be expected in the case of so numerous a people, the amount thus contributed is very large. In almost every town there is an office for the collection of the sacred funds and into which the tribute is paid. Then at particular seasons these funds are entrusted to men of good standing whose duty it is to convey them to Jerusalem. For this purpose it is always those of the highest rank that are chosen, as a kind of guarantee that that which is every Israelite's hope may reach the Holy City untampered with." That the withdrawal of those sums from the Roman provinces was frequently objected to we have already had occasion to mention. Flaccus for example had ordered the sums thus collected in Apamea, Laodicea, Adramyttium, and Pergamum to be confiscated. From the time of Caesar onwards however the withdrawal of this money has everywhere been sanctioned, even from Rome itself²²⁶ no less than from Asia Minor²²⁷ and

²²⁴ *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2: Θαυμάσιον δὲ μηδεὶς εἰ τοσούτος ἦν πλοῦτος ἐν τῷ ἡμετέρῳ ἱερῷ, πάντων τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην Ἰουδαίων καὶ σεβομένων τὸν θεόν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης εἰς αὐτὸ συμφερόντων ἐκ πολλῶν πάνυ χρόνων. On the question as to what items of tribute had to be paid by the Jews of the dispersion, see vol. i. p. 247.

²²⁵ Philo, *De monarchia*, book ii. § 3 (Mang. ii. 224).

²²⁶ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23 (Mang. ii. 568 sq.).

²²⁷ *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7. Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 40 (Mang. ii. 592).

Cyrenaica,²²⁸ and of course from Egypt also, as we have seen from the words of Philo already quoted. But there was no quarter from which the money poured in so abundantly as from Babylon and the districts beyond the Euphrates. Here the system of collecting and remitting was of a thoroughly organized kind. The head offices into which in the first instance the tribute (namely *τό τε δίδραχμον . . . καὶ ὅποσα ἄλλα ἀναθήματα*) was paid were in the two cities of Nisibis and Nehardea. Then at a particular date they were conveyed from these places to Jerusalem, many thousands of people being entrusted with this task so as to secure the sacred treasury against the attacks of the Parthian bandits.²²⁹ After the destruction of the temple the sacred tribute had necessarily to undergo at least some modification or other. The didrachmon was converted into a Roman tax, while the other items of tribute could from the nature of the case be no longer payable (comp. § 24, notes 95 and 109). But even in the altered state of things the Jews continued to evince their internal union by imposing a voluntary tax upon themselves. A new central authority, viz. the patriarchate, was created, and to this a portion at least of the sacred tribute required by their law was handed over year by year. Under this new arrangement the money was collected by individuals sent out by the patriarchate for the purpose, viz. the so-called *apostoli* (see above, p. 269).

But there was nothing that contributed so much to cement the bond of union between the dispersion and the mother country as the regular pilgrimages which Jews from all quarters of the world were in the habit of making to Jerusalem on festival occasions. "Many thousands of people from many thousands of towns made pilgrimages to the

²²⁸ *Antt.* xvi. 6. 5.

²²⁹ *Antt.* xviii. 9. 1. Comp. Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 31 (Mang. ii. 578). *Shekalim* iii. 4 (the didrachmae tax from Babylon and Media).

temple at every festival, some by land, some by sea, and coming from the east and the west, from the north and the south.”²³⁰ The number of Jews that were usually assembled in Jerusalem at the time of the feasts has been estimated by Josephus at as high a figure as 2,700,000, the inhabitants of Jerusalem being of course included.²³¹

5. *The Proselytes.*

As forming an essential element in the physiognomy of the Judaism of the dispersion, we must also mention that numerous body of adherents who in every quarter joined themselves to the Jewish communities and were known under the designation of *proselytes*.

On a mere cursory glance it seems strange that Jewish propagandism should have been at all crowned with anything like success among Gentile populations, for *the feeling on the part of the Graeco-Roman world toward the Jews* was by no means of a sympathetic character. We have already seen how, in the Hellenistic towns, the Jews were everywhere regarded with disfavour, how not only the mass of the people but the authorities themselves made repeated attempts to interfere with them in the free observance of their own religion (see above, pp. 260 sq., 275 sq.). Again, the *opinions*

²³⁰ Philo, *De monarchia*, book ii. § 1 (Mang. ii. 223): Μυρίαι γὰρ ἀπὸ μυρίων ὄσαν πόλεων οἱ μὲν διὰ γῆς, οἱ δὲ διὰ θαλάττης, ἐξ ἀνατολῆς καὶ δύσεως καὶ ἄρκτου καὶ μεσημβρίας, καθ' ἐκάστην ἑορτὴν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καταίρουσιν. On the pilgrimages from Babylon, comp. besides the passage already quoted, viz. *Antt.* xviii. 9. 1, also *Antt.* xvii. 2. 2. Mishna, *Joma* vi. 4; *Taanith* i. 3.

²³¹ *Bell. Jud.* vi. 9. 3. Comp. Grätz on this in the *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1871, pp. 200–207. The passage in Acts ii. 9–11 does not apply here, for according to ii. 5 it is not the festival pilgrims that are in view there, but foreign Jews who had their stated residence in Jerusalem.

expressed regarding them in Greek and Roman literature are for the most part of a highly disparaging kind.²³² By the majority of the educated people of that time the Jewish religion was looked upon as a *barbara superstitio*.²³³ Men did not hesitate to believe and circulate against them the most ridiculous and most abominable stories, stories that had been hatched above all by the literati of Alexandria. Many of the wretched allegations in question were of course due only to ignorance and not to malevolence. It was so for example when some inferred from the appellation *Judaei* that they belonged originally to Crete and derived their name from Mount Ida,²³⁴ or when others, in consequence of the famous golden vine in

²³² On this comp. Meier (Fr. Carol), *Judaica seu veterum scriptorum profanorum de rebus Judaicis fragmenta*, Jenae 1832. Schmitthenner (Chr. J.), *De rebus Judaicis quaecunque prodiderunt ethnici scriptores Graeci et Latini*, Weilburg 1844. Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* (4th ed.) i. 1. 50–52. Winer, *Realwörth.* i. 638 sq., note. Müller (J. G.), *Kritische Untersuchung der taciteischen Berichte über den Ursprung der Juden*, Hist. v. 2 sqq. (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, pp. 893–958). Frankel, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums*, 1856, pp. 81–94. *Ibid.* 1860, pp. 125–142. Giles, *Heathen Records to the Jewish Scripture History; containing all the extracts from the Greek and Latin writers in which the Jews and Christians are named*, London 1856. Goldschmidt, *De Judaeorum apud Romanos conditione*, Halis Sax. 1866. Gösser, *Die Berichte des classischen Alterthums über die Religion der Juden* (*Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.* 1868, pp. 565–637). Hausrath, *Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. i. pp. 149–156, iii. pp. 383–392. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, iii. 1871, pp. 513–515. Scheuffgen, *Unde Romanorum de Judaeis opiniones conflatae sint*, Köln 1870, Program for the Rheinische Ritter-Akademie of Bedburg. Gill, *Notices of the Jews and their Country by the classic writers of antiquity*, 2nd ed. London 1872. Geiger (Ludov.), *Quid de Judaeorum moribus atque institutis scriptoribus Romanis persuasum fuerit*, Berol. 1872. Grätz, *Ursprung der zwei Verlaumdungen gegen das Judenthum vom Eselskultus und von der Lieblosigkeit gegen Andersgläubige* (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1872, pp. 193–206). Rösch, *Caput asininum* (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1882, pp. 523–544) Schuhl, *Les préventions des Romains contre la religion juive*, Paris 1883, Durlacher. Hild, *Les juifs à Rome devant l'opinion et dans la littérature* (*Revue des études juives*, vol. viii. 1834, pp. 1–37, and sequel).

²³³ Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, chap. xxviii.

²³⁴ Tacit. *Hist.* v. 2.

the temple²³⁵ and certain observances at the feast of Tabernacles, were betrayed into supposing that they worshipped Bacchus, a view about which there is a somewhat protracted discussion in Plutarch,²³⁶ while Tacitus scouts it by simply remarking that: *Liber festos laetosque ritus posuit, Judaeorum mos absurdus sordidusque.*²³⁷ But the majority of the things alleged against the Jews were wicked slanders which for the most part owed their origin to the prolific soil of Alexandria. We find that the exodus from Egypt above all had, in the course of time, been worked up into a complete romance. The foundation of this had been already laid by Manetho (or an interpolator), and, after being further developed by the Alexandrian literati Chæremon, Lysimachus, Apion, it was taken up by Tacitus and Justin and retailed with sundry alterations and additions.²³⁸ The substance of this story is that a number of persons suffering from leprosy had been expelled from the country by an Egyptian king—sometimes called Amenophis and sometimes Bocchoris—and sent to the stone quarries or into the wilderness. Among them there happened to be a priest of Heliopolis of the name of *Moses* (whose real name, according to Manetho, was *Osarsiph*). This Moses prevailed upon the lepers to renounce the worship of the gods of Egypt and to adopt a new religion which he offered them. Under his leadership they then quitted the country, and after many vicissitudes and the perpetration of numerous disgraceful acts they reached the district around Jerusalem, which they proceeded to subdue and take permanent possession of. To the various incidents with which this exodus was accompanied, Tacitus has no

²³⁵ Mishna, *Middoth* iii. 8. Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 11. 3; *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 4. Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5.

²³⁶ Plutarch, *Sympos.* iv. 5.

²³⁷ Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5.

²³⁸ Manetho in Joseph. *contra Apion.* i. 26; Chæremon, *ibid.* i. 32; Apion, *ibid.* ii. 2. Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 3. Justin, xxxvi. 2. For more on the literary history, see below, § 33.

difficulty in tracing the origin of pretty nearly all the habits and usages of the Jews, whether of those that are real or of those that are only imputed. Apion the grammarian had already maintained that the Jews were in the habit of paying divine honours to an ass's head.²³⁹ Tacitus retails this as though he believed it to be true (notwithstanding the fact that immediately after he alludes to the absence of images in connection with their worship), and attributes it to the circumstance that, while in the wilderness, the Jews were indebted to a herd of wild asses for drawing their attention to some copious springs of water.²⁴⁰ The abstinence from the use of swine's flesh he accounts for by the fact that this animal is peculiarly liable to the itch, therefore to that very disease on account of which the Jews were once so severely maltreated. The frequent fasting is alleged to have been by way of commemorating the starvation from which they suffered during their journey through the wilderness. The use of unleavened bread, again, is supposed to be an evidence of the fact of their having stolen corn at the time of the exodus. And lastly, it is assumed that their observance of the seventh day of the week is due to the circumstance that this was the day on which their toils came to an end, and that, as they found it so pleasant to have nothing to do, they also consecrated the seventh year to idleness.²⁴¹

²³⁹ Joseph. *contra Apion.* ii. 7.

²⁴⁰ Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 3-4. On the ass-worship, comp. further Damocritus in Suida's *Lex.* under *Δαμόκριτος* (Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iv. 377). Tertullian, *Apologet.* c. xvi.; *ad nationes*, i. 11. Minucius Felix, *Octav.* c. ix. Röscher, *Caput asininum* (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1882, p. 523 sqq.), and the literature quoted there.

²⁴¹ Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 4: Sue se abstinent merito cladis, qua ipsos scabies quondam turpaverat, cui id animal obnoxium. Longam olim famen crebris adhuc jejuniis fatentur; et raptarum frugum argumentum panis Judaicus nullo fermento detinetur. Septimo die otium placuisse ferunt, quia, is finem laborum tulerit; dein blandiente inertia septimum quoque annum ignaviae datum.

There were three things in particular which the educated world of the time made the butt of its jeers, viz. the abstinence from the use of swine's flesh, the strict observance of the Sabbath, and the worship without images. While in Plutarch it is seriously debated whether the abstinence from the use of swine's flesh may not be due to the fact of divine honours being paid to this animal,²⁴² Juvenal again jokes about the land where "the clemency of the days of old has accorded to pigs the privilege of living to a good old age," and where "swine's flesh is as much valued as that of man." Then as for the observance of the Sabbath, the satirist can see nothing in it but indolence and sloth, while he looks upon Jewish worship as being merely an adoring of the clouds and the skies.²⁴³ It would appear again that contemporaries with a philosophical training had, in like manner, no appreciation whatever of the worshipping of God in spirit. It was not merely the literary swashbucklers of Alexandria who delighted in urging against the Jews the charge of refusing to worship the native divinities and the emperors,²⁴⁴ but we even find a man like Tacitus observing with singular coolness and not without a touch of censure, that:²⁴⁵ *Judaei menti sola unumque numen intelligunt: profanos qui deum imagines mortalibus materiis in species hominum effingant; summum illud et aeternum neque imitabile neque interitum. Igitur nulla simulacra urbibus suis, nedum templis sistunt; non regibus haec adulatio non Caesaribus honor.* And lastly, Pliny speaks of the Jews as a *gens contumelia numinum insignis*.²⁴⁶

²⁴² Plutarch, *Sympos.* iv. 5.

²⁴³ Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 160: *Et vetus indulget senibus clementia porcis.*

Ibid. xiv. 98: *Nec distare putant humana carne suillam.*

Ibid. xiv. 105-106: *Sed pater in causa, cui septima quaeque fuit lux Ignava et partem vitae non attigit ullam.*

Ibid. xiv. 97: *Nil praeter nubes et caeli numen adorant.*

²⁴⁴ Joseph. *contra Apion.* ii. 6.

²⁴⁵ Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5

²⁴⁶ Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xiii. 4-46.

But there was nothing that did so much to awaken the dislike of the Graeco-Roman world as that wall of rigid separation which the Jew had erected between himself and all the rest of mankind. And just at a time when the world-wide rule of the Romans and the levelling influences of Hellenism were pulling down more and more the ancient barriers that separated nation from nation, it must have been felt to be doubly annoying that the Jews should be the only people who insisted on holding aloof from this process of universal amalgamation. *Apud ipsos fides obstinata, misericordia in promptu, sed adversus omnes alios hostile odium*, says Tacitus,²⁴⁷ while Juvenal alleges against them, and not altogether without reason, that if asked to show the way to any place they always refused to do so except to those of their own faith, and that if any one happened to be looking for a well they would not take him to it unless he had been circumcised.²⁴⁸ When it was commonly alleged in Alexandria that the Jews had taken an oath never to show kindness to a stranger (Gentile),²⁴⁹ or that they even went the length of offering a Greek in sacrifice every year,²⁵⁰ these were no doubt ridiculous slanders. But still there is an element of truth underlying the statement of Tacitus, in which he

²⁴⁷ Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5.

²⁴⁸ Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv. 103-104 :

Non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti,
Quaesitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos.

²⁴⁹ Joseph. *contra Apion.* ii. 10.

²⁵⁰ Joseph. *contra Apion.* ii. 8. Comp. also Damocritus in Suidas' *Lex.* under *Δαμόκριτος* (Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iv. 377). J. G. Müller, *Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen Apion* (1877), p. 263 sqq. As is well known, similar charges (as for example that the Jews murdered people who were not of their own faith to use their blood for sacrificial purposes) continue to be alleged against them down to the present day. Christians were also charged with holding *Θυέστεια δείπνα* (circular of the churches of Lyons and Vienne, quoted by Euseb. *H. E.* v. 1. 14. Athenagoras, *Suppl.* c. iii. Justin. Martyr. *Apol.* ii. 12. Minucius Felix, *Octav.* c. ix. Tertullian, *Apolog.* c. viii.; *ad nationes*, i. 7. Origen, *contra Cels.* vi. 27).

affirms that the first things Jewish proselytes are taught to do are to despise the gods, to repudiate their nationality, and to disparage parents, children and brothers.²⁵¹ The truth is, it was just this that formed the bright as well as the dark side of Judaism, the fact namely that, as a religious community, it maintained its exclusiveness with such uncompromising rigour.

The feelings cherished toward the Jews throughout the entire Graeco-Roman world were not so much those of hatred as of pure contempt. The prevailing tone that runs through the whole estimate of Judaism, as given by Tacitus, is that of the profoundest contempt, the contempt of the proud Roman for this despectissima pars servientium, for this teterrima gens.²⁵² Those feelings have found their bitterest expression in the words of Marcus Aurelius as recorded by Ammianus Marcellinus: Ille enim cum Palaestinam transiret Aegyptum petens, Judaeorum faetentium et tumultantium saepe taedio percitus dolenter dicitur exclamasse: O Marcomanni, O Quadi, O Sarmatae, tandem alios vobis inertiores inveni.²⁵³

It may be asked, and that not without reason, how it was possible, if such were the feelings of the Graeco-Roman world, that *Jewish propagandism should have met with any success at all*. In order to understand this, three things must be borne in mind. (1) In the course of their missionary efforts the Jews to all appearance understood above all things how to present Judaism in a form calculated to recommend it even to a Greek or a Roman. They took care to keep in the background, as not being of the nature of an essential, whatever was certain at first to appear odd or to have a repelling effect, while they laid most stress upon those points in regard to which they felt they could reckon on a sympathetic appreciation of them in

²⁵¹ Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5: Contemnere deos, exuere patriam, parentes, liberos, fratres vilia habere.

²⁵² Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 8.

²⁵³ Ammian. Marcellin. xxii. 5.

the case of many at least; this they did above all with respect to their idea of God. Judaism is the truly rational religion, rejecting as it does the notion of a multiplicity of gods with circumscribed spheres of action, and worshipping the one Lord and Creator of all things and Him only, even that Almighty and righteous God who is omnipotent, and who recompenses every one strictly according to his moral conduct. Nor, like a shortsighted heathenism, does it represent the Divine Being in the finite form of a man or even of an animal, but it rejects every material representation of Him, and makes the invisible Lord of heaven and earth, who rules over all and who transcends all the limits of the material world, the sole object of its worship. That it was upon these points that the greatest stress was laid, and that it was in this form that, in the first instance, Judaism was presented by the Hellenistic Jews to their Gentile fellow-citizens, is what any one may be convinced of who will only give a cursory glance at the writings of Philo and the Jewish Sibylline books. Those people (the Jews) are proudly conscious that they are the truly enlightened ones of the earth, who, as regards religious matters at least, rank highest in the scale of civilisation. And it was surely impossible that such a consciousness should not ultimately produce its due effect. Hence one can understand how Strabo for example should be found to speak of *Moses* with a certain degree of sympathy; for the Jewish source—whether written or oral—on which his narrative is based, has obviously presented the Jewish legislator to him in the light of a genuine Stoic philosopher. Moses taught, he informs us, “that the Egyptians had erred in making the divinity to resemble animals; that such a thing was not done by the Libyans, nor even by the Greeks, who represented Him under a human form. For that alone is God which embraces us all as well as the earth and the sea, which we name heaven, and world, and the nature of things (εἷη γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ μόνον θεὸς

τὸ περιέχον ἡμᾶς ἅπαντας καὶ γῆν καὶ θάλατταν, δ̄ καλούμεν οὐρανὸν καὶ κόσμον καὶ τὴν τῶν ὄντων φύσιν). But what man in his senses would venture to make an image of that, an image only resembling something around us? Rather must the making of images be given up altogether, and a worthy temple being consecrated to Him, let Him be worshipped without any image whatever.²⁵⁴ It is true that for all that Strabo did not become a Jew, for he knew too well that the Jewish religion had subsequently deteriorated owing to so many superstitious elements having been mixed up with it.²⁵⁵ But if Jewish apologists now knew, as they did, how to give a profounder meaning and import even to those "superstitious" elements, may it not be that many a one felt himself attracted by them? (2) A further circumstance which was well calculated to win adherents to Judaism was the fact that the Jewish religion aimed at the practical realization of a moral and happy life. Strictly speaking, there was no religion from which such an aim could be said to be entirely absent. But in the case of Judaism it assumed a much more definite, more complete, and more satisfactory form than in any of the ancient heathen religions. The Greek and Roman gods could help their worshippers neither to a truly moral nor to a truly happy life. Now Judaism, through its sacrifices and purifications, its complicated system of religious prescriptions and the promise given to those who observed them, held out the certain prospect of both those things. And if deliverance from sin and sorrow be the deepest longing of the human heart, is it possible that a religion which seemed to afford a more certain prospect of such deliverance than those of heathendom could pretend to do, could fail to have its attractions even in spite of the seeming repulsiveness of many of its externals? (3) Lastly, it was also an advantage to Judaism as well, that it happened to be so much the

²⁵⁴ Strabo, xvi. 2. 35, p. 760 sq.

²⁵⁵ Strabo, xvi. 2. 37, p. 761.

fashion of the time to patronize Oriental religions generally. The religions of classical antiquity no longer exercised the same absolute power of attracting the minds of men as once they did. On all hands people were itching for something new, and they eagerly clutched at those mysterious Oriental worships which, owing to increased intercourse and more extended commercial relations, were every day becoming more widely known.²⁵⁶ We find that in Greece, and more particularly in Athens, the Phrygian worships of Sabazius (Bacchus) and the great mother of the gods had got a footing even at so early a period as the end of the fifth century B.C.²⁵⁷ The Egyptian and other Oriental ones followed not long after. In the year 333 B.C. the Athenians issued a decree giving permission to the merchants from Citium (Cyprus) to build a temple to Aphrodite, therefore to the Semitic Astarte, in the Piræus; while on this occasion reference is made to the fact that the Egyptians already had a temple of Isis in the same place.²⁵⁸ This latter therefore must have been built about the middle of the fourth century B.C. A century farther on, viz. about 250 B.C., we also find a collegium of worshippers

²⁵⁶ On this and the state of religious matters throughout the Graeco-Roman world generally, comp. Tzschirner, *Der Fall des Heidenthums* (Leipzig 1829), pp. 13–164, especially p. 74 sqq. Döllinger, *Heidenthum und Judenthum, Vorhalle zur Geschichte des Christenthums*, Regensb. 1857. Schneckenburger, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgesch.* pp. 40–61. Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgesch.*, 2nd ed. ii. 1–88. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, iii. 1871, pp. 421–504. Keim, *Rom und das Christenthum* (from Keim's unpublished remains, and edited by Ziegler, Berlin 1881), pp. 1–131, especially p. 86 sqq. Foucart, *Des associations religieuses chez les Grecs*, Paris 1873. Boissier, *La religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins*, 2 vols., 2nd ed. Paris 1878. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 1878, pp. 71–112. Preller, *Römische Mythologie*, 3rd ed. by Jordan, vol. ii. 1883, pp. 359–453. A considerable amount of material may be found in the Indices to the *Corp. Inscr. Lat.*

²⁵⁷ See in particular, Foucart, *Des associations religieuses chez les Grecs*, chap. ix. x. and xi.

²⁵⁸ Foucart, pp. 187–189 = *Corp. Inscr. Atticarum*, ii. 1, n. 168: *καθ' ἅπας καὶ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τὸ τῆς Ἰσίδος ἱερὸν ἱδρυνται.*

of Serapis (*Σεραπιού*) in the Piræus.²⁵⁹ In the last-mentioned case it is obvious that the association is now no longer composed merely of foreigners, but, as the Greek names of the members serve to show, of natives as well. And so we find that since the third century B.C. Egyptian cults had come to be very widely practised throughout Greece generally.²⁶⁰ Besides these, other Oriental worships, and that in strange admixture, are also to be met with particularly in the islands of Greece and in Asia Minor.²⁶¹ In Rome again it was in like manner the Egyptian worships above all that, at an early period, gained a firm footing.²⁶² Even so far back as the second century B.C. they had begun to make their appearance here, and although repeatedly forbidden by the senate and put down by force, still they always sprang up afresh. In the year 43 B.C. the triumvirs themselves built a temple of Serapis and Isis for public worship.²⁶³ Consequently by this time the worship of the gods of Egypt must have been no longer an affair merely of private associations, but carried on under the auspices of the state itself. In the time of Augustus there were already several temples in Rome for the Egyptian sacra, though of course outside the pomerium as

²⁵⁹ *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 120=Foucart, p. 207=*Corp. Inscr. Attic.* ii. 1, n. 617.

²⁶⁰ See Preller, *Ueber Inschriften aus Chäronea* (Transactions of the *Sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* 1854, p. 195 sqq.). Lafaye, *Histoire du culte des divinités d'Alexandrie Sérapis, Isis, Harpocrate et Anubis hors de l'Égypte depuis les origines jusqu'à la naissance de l'école néo-platonicienne*, Paris 1884 (especially pp. 1-38). Comp. in general also Matthiä, art. "Isis," in Ersch and Gruber's *Allg. Encyc.* sec. ii. vol. xxiv. (1845), pp. 427-435. Georgii in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iii. 1509 sqq. (art. "Horus"), and iv. pp. 276-300 (art. "Isis").

²⁶¹ Foucart, chaps. xi. xii. xiii.

²⁶² See Reichel, *De Isidis apud Romanos cultu*, Berol. 1849. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 76 sqq. Preller, *Römische Mythologie* (3rd ed. by Jordan), ii. pp. 373-385. Lafaye, as above, pp. 38-63, and elsewhere. The inscriptions of the city of Rome in *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. vi. n. 344-355 (Isis), and n. 570-574 (Serapis).

²⁶³ Dio Cass. xlvii. 15.

yet.²⁶⁴ In the reign of Tiberius an attempt was made to suppress them entirely.²⁶⁵ But many of the succeeding emperors only favoured them so much the more. During the whole imperial age they were disseminated to an unusual degree throughout the provinces especially. At a somewhat later period the Egyptian worships were followed by those of Asia Minor, Syria, and Persia, which also found a footing in Rome. Here their palmy days did not begin till the second century of our era. The worship of the Syrian sun-god was the one to which the Antonines showed special favour.²⁶⁶ But that of the Persian Mithras, with its dark mysteries, was in still greater favour, and that throughout the entire Roman Empire. Upon the inscriptions in almost every province of the empire there is no Oriental worship that we so frequently meet with in imperial times as this.²⁶⁷ The secret of the attraction which all those worships possessed lay essentially in two characteristic features common to them all.²⁶⁸ In the first place, in all of them there is a touch of monotheism in some form or other. No matter whether the divinity was known under the designation of Isis, or Serapis, or Mithras, or any other, there was, as a rule, bound up with this designation

²⁶⁴ Dio Cass. liii. 2.

²⁶⁵ Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 3. 4. Tacitus, *Annal.* ii. 85. Sueton. *Tiber* xxxvi.

²⁶⁶ On the Syrian worships, comp. Preller, *Römische Mythologie* (3rd ed.), ii. 394 ff. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 82.

²⁶⁷ On the Persian Mithras himself, comp. Windischmann, *Mithra, ein Beitrag zur Mythengeschichte des Orients* (*Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. i., Leipzig 1859). On the spread of his worship throughout the Roman Empire, see Zoega, *Ueber die den Dienst des Mithras betreffenden römischen Kunstdenkmäler* (Zoega's *Abhandlungen*, edited by Welcker, 1817, pp. 89–210 and 394–416). Preller, *Römische Mythologie*, 3rd ed. ii. 408–418. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 82 sqq. Renan, *Marc-Aurèle* (1882), pp. 575–580. T. Fabri, *De Mithraei dei solis invicti apud Romanos cultu*, *Dissert. inaug.* 1883. For the inscriptions of the city of Rome, see *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. vi. n. 713–754.

²⁶⁸ On this comp. briefly Marquardt, iii. 84 sqq., for example.

—at least at the time now in question—the idea now more and now less plainly indicated, that this supreme divine being had no equal, nay that the different names were but different designations for one and the same God. The other characteristic feature was the practical tendency connected with that putting away of sin and that moral purity which, though only in the form it might be of an external, often an absurd asceticism, were, in the case of almost the whole of those worships, demanded of those who embraced them, and in return for which they had the promise of deliverance from sin and misery. But in those two leading features it is impossible not to recognise an actual superiority of the Oriental cults over those of the rest of antiquity. For however absurd and repugnant their mode of expressing it might be, they nevertheless answered to a genuine religious need in laying, as they did, the chief stress upon those two points. Now it may be confidently affirmed that Judaism answered this need in a much more perfect manner. If so, where was the wonder that even this *teterrima gens* should yet have found so many who were prepared to embrace its religion? The results in this respect would doubtless have been much more favourable still, if the despised social position of the Jews, and the somewhat non-aesthetic character of the worship, and the load of oppressive and seemingly meaningless and nonsensical ceremonies and observances, had not proved a formidable obstacle. In the Hellenistico-Roman period *Jewish propagandism* seems to have been carried on with great activity. One should have thought that, strictly speaking, orthodox Pharisaic Judaism could hardly have been justified in making any effort whatever to obtain converts to the religion of Israel beyond the circle of its own countrymen. For if it be true that the promise applied only to the children of Abraham, then what, in that case, were the Gentiles to gain by their conversion to the Jewish faith? But here the natural

impulse—so characteristic of all active religionists—to impart to others the blessings which they themselves possess, proved too powerful for dogmatic preconceptions. If by his conversion to Judaism the Gentile would not acquire all the privileges of the true Israelite, still he would thereby be snatched from the mass of those doomed to perdition, and have some connection at least with the people of the promise. Consequently we find that even the Pharisees in Palestine developed an active zeal for conversions. “They compassed sea and land to make *one* proselyte” (Matt. xxiii. 15). Matters however were in a totally different position in the dispersion. For Hellenistic Judaism descent from Abraham was, as may be seen from Philo, only a secondary matter after all, while the true worship of God was regarded as of paramount importance. Here then the desire to convert heathendom from its blindness and folly would of necessity assert itself far more strongly than in Palestine. And hence it is that a portion of the Judæo-Hellenistic literature is essentially devoted to the promotion of this object (see § 33). How active they were in their labours is sufficiently proved by the way in which Horace satirizes the proselytizing zeal of the Jews.²⁶⁹

The success with which those efforts were crowned was in any case something very considerable.²⁷⁰ If we may judge

²⁶⁹ Horace, *Sat.* i. 4. 142–143: *ac veluti te Judæi cogemus in hanc concedere turbam.* Comp. Danz, *Cura Judæorum in conquærendis proselytis, ad Matt. xxiii. 15* (Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, 1736, pp. 649–676). Wetstein, *Nov. Test.*, note on Matt. xxiii. 15, and the commentators generally on this passage. For the erroneous interpretation of it given by Grätz, see *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1869, p. 169 sq. The historical truth of the thing assumed in Matt. xxiii. 15 is also maintained by Kuenen (*Volksreligion und Weltreligion*, German translation, 1883, pp. 332–334).

²⁷⁰ On the proselytism of the Jews, comp. Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 407–411. Selden, *De synedriis*, lib. i. c. iii., lib. ii. c. iii. Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, pp. 31–52 of the notes (and at p. 51 sqq. of the

from the numerous hints we come across, it may be assumed that, in the Hellenistico-Roman period, the number of those who allied themselves more or less closely with the Jewish communities, took part in Jewish worship, and observed the Jewish ordinances with a greater or less degree of strictness, was a very large one, although not quite equal to that of the worshippers of Isis and Mithras. "Many of the Greeks," as Josephus boasts, "have been converted to the observance of our laws; some have remained true, while others, who were incapable of steadfastness, have fallen away again."^{270a} "Likewise among the mass of the people," he remarks in another passage, "there has for a long time now been a great amount of zeal for our worship; nor is there a single town among Greeks or barbarians or anywhere else, not a single nation to which the observance of the Sabbath as it exists among ourselves

same, the older literature). Deyling, *De σεβομενοις του θεου* (*Observatt. sacr.* ii. pp. 462-469). Various dissertations in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxii. Lübker, *Die Proselyten der Juden* (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, pp. 681-700). Winer, *Realwörterb.* ii. 285-287. Leyrer, art. "Proselyten," in Herzog's *Real-Encyc.*, 1st ed. xii. 237-250. In the second edition and re-written by Delitzsch, xii. 293-300. De Wette, *Lehrb. der bibl. Archäologie* (4th ed.), pp. 374-377. Keil, *Handb. der bibl. Archäologie* (2nd ed.), pp. 339-342. Zetzschwitz, *System der christl. kirchl. Katechetik.* vol. i. (1863), pp. 210-227. Holtzmann in Weber and Holtzmann's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. 268 sqq. Hausrath, *Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. ii. 111-123. Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, pp. 220-229. Grünebaum, *Die Fremden nach rabbinischen Gesetzen* (Geiger's *Jüd. Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben*, 1870, pp. 43-57; 1871, pp. 164-172). Steiner in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* iv. pp. 629-631. Bernay's *Die Gottesfürchtigen bei Juvenal* (*Commentationes philol. in honorem Th. Mommseni*, 1877, pp. 563-569; also in Bernay's *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1885, ii. pp. 71-80). Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.'s*, § 557. Hamburger, *Real-Encyc. für Bibel und Talmud*, 2nd part, art. "Proselyt;" also the articles "Nichtisraelit," "Noachiden," "Helene," "Izates," "Monobaz." Grätz, *Die jüdischen Proselyten im Römerreiche unter den Kaisern Domitian, Nerva, Trajan und Hadrian* (*Jahresbericht des jüd.-theol. Seminares zu Breslau*, 1883). Kuenen, *Volksreligion und Weltreligion* (German edition, 1883), pp. 224-227.

^{270a} *Apion.* ii. 10: πολλοὶ παρ' αὐτῶν εἰς τοὺς ἡμετέρους νόμους συνέβησαν εἰσελθεῖν, καὶ τινὲς μὲν ἔμειναν, εἰσὶ δ' οἱ τὴν κατωτέριαν οὐχ ὑπομείναντες πάλιν ἐπίστῃσαν.

has not penetrated; while fasting and the burning of lights, and many of our laws with regard to meats, are also observed.”²⁷¹

²⁷¹ *Apion. ii. 39*: καὶ πλήθεσιν ἤδη πολὺς ζῆλος γέγονεν ἐκ μακροῦ τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐσεβείας, οὐδ' ἔστιν οὐ πόλις Ἑλλήνων οὐδ' ἡτισοῦν οὐδὲ βάρβαρος, οὐδὲ ἐν ἔθνος, ἔνθα μὴ τὸ τῆς ἐβδομάδος, ἣν ἀργοῦμεν ἡμεῖς, ἔθος οὐ διαπεφοίτηκε, καὶ αἱ νηστεῖαι καὶ λύχνων ἀνακαύσεις καὶ πολλὰ τῶν εἰς βρῶσιν ἡμῶν οὐ νομοισμένων παρατετήρηται. *Comp. Tertullian, ad nationes, i. 13*: Vos certe estis, qui etiam in laterculum septem dierum solem recepistis, et ex diebus ipso priorem praelegistis, quo die lavacrum subtrahatis aut in vesperam differatis, aut otium et prandium curetis. Quod quidem facitis exorbitantes et ipsi a vestris ad alienas religiones. Judaei enim festi sabbata et coena pura et Judaici ritus lucernarum et jejunia cum azymis et orationes litorales, quae utique aliena sunt a diis vestris. No doubt Tertullian is here speaking only of Gentiles who observed certain Jewish practices. So in the case of Josephus one has an impression that he also has in view the observance of Jewish practices outside the circle of the Jewish communities. He aims at showing how the laws of the Jews found an echo even among those who were not Jews themselves. In proof of this he first of all mentions the fact that the Greek philosophers had drawn largely upon those laws; and then he proceeds to point out in the way already stated how the observance of Jewish practices was often to be met with among the mass of the people as well. Still it appears to me to be plain that here it is not mere analogies between Gentile and Jewish practices that the historian has in view (such practices as the adopting of the week of seven days and the Orphico-Pythagorean asceticism). For what Josephus also finds among those who are not Jews is precisely the Jewish manner of observing the Sabbath as well as the observance of the Jewish regulations with respect to meats. But it is the reference to the practice of burning lights (λύχνων ἀνακαύσεις, *ritus lucernarum*, as Tertullian calls it) that shows above all that the matter in question is an actual imitating of Jewish practices. For the practice in view is obviously that of burning lights before the dawn of the Sabbath, so that in the course of that day there may be no occasion to violate the law against the lighting of the fire on the Sabbath (*Ex. xxxv. 3*). *Comp. on this "Sabbath-light" (יְרֵ הַשַּׁבָּת)*, *Mishna, Shabbath ii. 6, 7*. *Vitringa, De synagoga vetere*, pp. 194–199 (*ibid.* also at p. 1123, where the passage from *Shabbath xxxv.* is given). *Seneca, Epist. xcv. 47* (ed. Haase): Quomodo sint di colendi, solet praecipui: accendere aliquem lucernas sabbatis prohibeamus, etc. The matter is described with great pungency by the satirist *Persius*, who says (*Sat. v. 179–184*): “But when the days of Herod come round (*i.e.* the Jewish Sabbaths observed by Herod), and the lamps placed in the greasy window emit their thick smoke (*unctaque fenestra || dispositae pinguem nebulam vomuere lucernae*), and in the red plate the tail of a tunny-fish swims, and the white jug overflows with wine, then thou silently movest the lips and

Seneca²⁷² and Dio Cassius²⁷³ bear testimony to precisely the same effect, though from a different standpoint. For the purpose of accounting for the large amount of treasure in the temple at Jerusalem, Josephus appeals not merely to the copious tribute sent in by Jews in every part of the world, but also to that contributed by the "God-fearing," *i.e.* the proselytes.²⁷⁴ In stating the number of Jews of every nationality that were living in Jerusalem, the Acts (ii. 9–11) does not forget to mention the proselytes along with the Jews (ii. 10: Ἰουδαῖοι τε καὶ προσήλυτοι). And we find that those general testimonies are corroborated by numerous details of one kind or another. In Antioch "the Jews always got a large number of Greeks to come to their religious services when they treated them as, in a certain sense, a part of themselves."²⁷⁵ In Antioch of Pisidia Paul addressed those assembled in the synagogue as: ἄνδρες

turnest pale at the Sabbaths of the circumcised." Josephus is therefore to be understood as speaking of the observance of practices of a specifically Jewish character by those who were not native Jews; and in doing so he distinguishes between those people who have a "zeal for our religion" (ζήλος τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐσεβείας) and the philosophers who, while borrowing a great deal from Moses, nevertheless "to all appearance continue to adhere to their native practices" (τῷ δοκεῖν τὰ πάτρια διεφύλαττον). Consequently he has in view those who have consciously adopted Jewish practices as such. Certainly he does not appear to regard them as belonging to the number of those who had joined the Jewish communities; and besides, Tertullian speaks of those who thoughtlessly adopted only one or two of the Jewish practices. From this then we can see that the line of demarcation was somewhat ill defined.

²⁷² Seneca as quoted by Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, vi. 11: Cum interim usque eo sceleratissimae gentis consuetudo convaluit, ut per omnes jam terras recepta sit, victi victoribus leges dederunt. . . . Illi tamen causas ritus sui noverunt; major pars populi facit, quod cur faciat ignorat.

²⁷³ Dio Cass. xxxvii. 17: "Ἡ τε γὰρ χώρα Ἰουδαία καὶ αὐτοὶ Ἰουδαῖοι ὀνομάζονται. Ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ κλησὶς αὐτῇ ἐκείνοις μὲν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅθεν ἤρξατο γενέσθαι, φέρεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους ὅσοι τὰ νόμιμα αὐτῶν, καί περ ἄλλοις θυνεῖς ὄντες, ζηλοῦσι.

²⁷⁴ *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2.

²⁷⁵ *Bell. Jud.* vii. 3. 3: αἰεὶ τε προσαγόμενοι ταῖς θρησκείαις πολλὸν πολῆθος Ἑλλήνων καὶ ἐκείνους τρόπῳ τινὶ μοῖραν αὐτῶν πεποιηντο.

Ἰσραηλείται καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν (Acts xiii. 16) ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραὰμ καὶ οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν (Acts xiii. 26). After the service was concluded there followed him πολλοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων (Acts xiii. 43; comp. also xiii. 50). In Thessalonica there was converted by Paul τῶν σεβομένων Ἑλλήνων πλῆθος πολὺ (Acts xvii. 4). In Athens Paul preaches in the synagogue τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ τοῖς σεβομένοις (Acts xvii. 17). Consequently we find that wherever there was a Jewish community there was also a body of proselytes attached to it. That in Rome too Jewish propagandism must have been attended with some measure of success, is evident from the satires of a Horace or a Juvenal.²⁷⁶ Then, as in the case of every religious movement, so also in the case of Jewish propagandism, it was found that it was the female heart that was most impressionable. In Damascus nearly the whole female portion of the inhabitants was devoted to Judaism.²⁷⁷ And not unfrequently it was precisely women of rank who showed those leanings.²⁷⁸ We also read of at least several instances of the conversion of men occupying distinguished positions.²⁷⁹ But the most notable triumph of the proselytizing

²⁷⁶ Horace, *Sat.* i. 9. 68–72 (where the person who observes the Jewish Sabbath is described as *unus multorum*). Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv. 96–106. A certain Beturia Paulina . . . quae bixit an. LXXXVI. menses VI. proselita an. XVI. nominae Sara is mentioned upon a Roman inscription in Orelli's *Inscr. Lat.* n. 2522. Again, the Φλαβία Ἀντωνῖνα γυνὴ Δατίβου τοῦ ζ' α' βίου ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν Αὔγουστινῶν, mentioned on another Roman epitaph (*Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9903 = Fiorelli, *Catalogo del Museo di Napoli*, *Inscr. Lat.* n. 1960), was certainly not a native Jewess. Comp. in general, Caspari, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, iii. 274 sq.

²⁷⁷ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 2.

²⁷⁸ Acts xiii. 50, xvii. 4. Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 3. 5. In this latter passage we read of how, on one occasion, a couple of Jewish swindlers defrauded a Roman lady of rank and a devotee of Judaism of a large sum of money under the pretext of sending it to the temple in Jerusalem. On the Empress Poppaea, see above, p. 238.

²⁷⁹ Acts viii. 26 sqq. (the treasurer of Queen Candace). Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 7. 1, 3 (Azizus of Emesa and Polemon of Cilicia, both of them brothers-in-

ing zeal of the Jews was the conversion of the royal house of Adiabene, to which Josephus recurs again and again with manifest pride (*Antt.* xx. 2–4; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 19. 2, iv. 9. 11, v. 2. 2, 3. 3, 4. 2, 6. 1, vi. 6. 3, 4).²⁸⁰ The kingdom of Adiabene, situated on the confines of the Roman and Parthian Empires, and standing towards the latter in a certain relation of dependence, was in the time of Claudius under the rule of a monarch called Izates, who, with his mother Helena, became a convert to Judaism, and subsequently induced his brother Monobazus and all the rest of his kindred to follow his example.²⁸¹ Owing to its conversion this family came to have

law of Agrippa II.). Only as being an analogous case we may here mention the consul Flavius Clemens and his wife Domitilla, for it is probable that it was Christianity to which they were converted and not Judaism. On this see Dio Cass. lxxvii. 14. Sueton. *Domitian.* c. xv.; and on another Domitilla, the niece of that same consul Clement, and in regard to whom it is expressly stated that she was a Christian, see Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* iii. 18. 4, 5; Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene, ii. 160, 163, *ad. ann. Abr.* 2112 (where the chronographer Bruttius or Brettius is mentioned as his authority, for whom comp. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iv. 352). There is further the name of a Domitilla, who probably was also a Christian, on the inscription, n. 948 in vol. vi. of *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* Comp. in general, Volkmar, *Theol. Jahrbücher*, 1856, p. 297 sqq. Zahn, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (1868), p. 44 sqq. Idem, *Zeitschr. für die histor. Theologie*, 1869, p. 627 sqq. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 435 sqq. Lipsius, *Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe* (1869), pp. 147–162. Seyerlen, *Entstehung und erste Schicksale der Christengemeinde in Rom* (1874), p. 56 sqq. Caspari, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, iii. pp. 282, 293 sqq. De Rossi, *Bullettino di archeologia cristiana*, 1875 (notice of this in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1876, 290 sq.). Harnack, *Clementis Romani epistulae* (2nd ed. 1876), *prolegom.* p. lxii. sq. Erbes, *Jahrb. für prot. Theol.* 1878, p. 690 sqq. Funk, *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1879, p. 531 sqq. Neubauer, *Beiträge zu einer Gesch. der römischen Christengemeinde in den beiden ersten Jahrhunderten* (Elbing 1880, school programme), pp. 18 sq., 37. Hasenclever, *Christliche Proselyten der höhern Stände im ersten Jahrhundert* (*Jahrb. für prot. Theol.* 1882, pp. 34 sqq., 230 sqq.). Heuser, art. "Domitilla," in Wetzzer and Welte's *Kirchenlex.*, 2nd ed. vol. iii. (1884), p. 1953 sqq.

²⁸⁰ Comp. also Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, i. 341 sqq. Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, p. 223 sqq. Brull, *Jahrbücher für jüdische Gesch. und Literatur*, vol. i. 1874, pp. 58–86. Grätz, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1877, pp. 241 sqq., 289 sqq. Hamburger, *Real-Encyc. für Bibel und Talmud*, part ii. arts. "Helene," "Izates," "Monobaz."

²⁸¹ Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 2–4. Izates is also mentioned by Tacitus, *Annal*

numerous relations of one kind or another with Jerusalem. Izates sent five of his sons to be educated there.²⁸² Helena made a pilgrimage thither, and during the famine in the time of Claudius she gave away large quantities of the necessities of life to be distributed among the people.²⁸³ According to a Rabbinical tradition, she is said to have been a Nazarite for fourteen, or as some others allege, even for twenty-one years.²⁸⁴ Both Helena and Monobazus (who succeeded his brother as king) had a palace in Jerusalem.²⁸⁵ They both presented valuable cups to the temple there.²⁸⁶ When Izates and his mother died, Monobazus caused them to be buried in Jerusalem in a magnificent tomb which had been built by Helena herself.²⁸⁷ During the Jewish wars some relatives of xii. 13, 14, as being king of Adiabene in the time of Claudius. Monobazus is mentioned as belonging to Nero's time by Tacitus, *Annal.* xv. 1, 14. Dio Cass. lxii. 20, 23, lxiii. 1. On the later history, see the outline in Marquardt *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. 1881, p. 435 sqq.

²⁸² *Antt.* xx. 3. 4.

²⁸³ *Antt.* xx. 2. 6.

²⁸⁴ *Nasir* iii. 6: "If any one has vowed to be a Nazarite for a longer period and after the time of his vow has expired comes to the land of Israel, then, according to the school of Shammai, he is a Nazarite for thirty days, while according to the school of Hillel, he is so over again from the beginning. Queen Helena, on the occasion of her son's setting out for the war, vowed, saying: If my son comes back safe I will be a Nazarite for seven years. He did come back, and she became a Nazarite for seven years; and not till after the expiry of the seven years did she come to the land of Israel. Then the school of Hillel declared that she was bound to be a Nazarite for still other seven years; and as, at the end of this latter seven years, she was defiled, she was therefore a Nazarite twenty-one years in all. Rabbi Judah says: She was so only fourteen years."

²⁸⁵ *Bell. Jud.* v. 6. 1, vi. 6. 3. A female relative of Izates' of the name of Grapte also had a palace in Jerusalem, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 11.

²⁸⁶ *Joma* iii. 10: "King Monobaz (מונבז) caused all the handles of the utensils that were made use of on the great day of atonement to be made of gold. His mother Helena again caused a golden lamp (נברשת), the same word precisely as that used in Dan. v. 5) to be placed over the door of the temple: while she also caused a golden tablet to be made on which was written the passage about the adulterous woman."

²⁸⁷ *Antt.* xx. 4. 3; *Bell. Jud.* v. 2. 2, 3. 3, 4. 2. The tomb consisted of three pyramids (*Antt.* xx. 4. 3). Eusebius, who had seen it himself, speaks of *στῆλαι* (Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 12. 3: τῆς γὰρ τοι' Ἑλένης . . . εἰστί νῦν στήλαι.

Monobazus fought on the side of the Jews against the Romans.²⁶⁸

The form which the adhesion of Gentiles to Judaism assumed, and the extent to which they observed the ceremonial law of

διαφανείς ἐν προαστείσις δείκνυνται τῆς νῦν Αἰλίας). It was so famous that Pausanias, *Descr. Graeciae*, viii. 16, compares it with the tomb of Mausolus. The account he gives of it is certainly of a somewhat fabulous character. He says, for instance, that by means of a wonderful piece of mechanism the stone door of the tomb opened of itself at a particular time once in every year, and then closed again in the same way; at any other time it would have been impossible to open it without destroying it altogether. From the passages in *Bell. Jud.* it would appear that the tomb stood to the north of the city, and according to *Antt.* xx. 4. 3, at a distance of three stadia from it. According to Jerome, *Peregrinatio S. Paulae*, c. vi., it stood on the left side (therefore on the east side) of the road to one coming southward (ad laevam musoleo Helenae derelicto . . . ingressa est Hierosolymam). All this renders it highly probable that it is identical with the so-called kings' tombs of the present day, the largest site of an ancient burying-place to be found in the vicinity of Jerusalem. On this see Robinson's *Palestine*. Idem, *Modern Biblical Researches* (in favour of the identity). Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xvi. 475 sqq. (also in favour of identity). Tobler, *Topographie von Jerusalem*, ii. 276-323 (against the identity). Raoul Rochett, *Revue archéologique*, vol. ix. 1 (1852), pp. 22-37 (in favour of the identity). Quatremère, *ibid.* pp. 92-113, 157-169 (who takes the kings' tombs to be the tomb of Herod). De Saulcy, *Revue archéologique*, vol. ix. 1 (1852), p. 229 sqq., ix. 2 (1853), pp. 398-407. Idem, *Voyage en Terre Sainte* (1865), i. 345-410 (who takes the kings' tombs to be the tombs of the ancient kings of Judah). Creuzer, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 913 sqq. Bäderker-Socin, *Palästina* (1875), p. 246 sqq. A strong argument in favour of the identity of the kings' tombs with the tomb of Helena is to be found in the fact that in the former a sarcophagus was discovered by De Saulcy, on which there is an inscription in two lines, the first of which runs thus: צֶדָּה מַלְכָּתָא (the Queen Zaddan), the second thus: צֶדָּה מַלְכָּתָא (the Queen Zadda). The language of both lines is Aramaic, but the character in which the first is written is the genuine Syriac, while that of the second is the square Hebrew character. Now surely this is only to be accounted for by the fact that the Queen Zaddan or Zadda in question, and in any case a Jewish queen, belonged to a Syrian royal house which can have been no other than that of Adiabene. See Renan, *Journal Asiatique*, sixth series, vol. vi. (1865) p. 550 sqq. Chwolson, *Corp. Inscr. Hebraicarum* (1882), col. 72 sq. and facsimile, n. 8. For a representation of the sarcophagus and the inscription, see also De Saulcy, *Voyage en Terre Sainte*, i. pp. 377, 385.

²⁶⁸ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 19. 2, vi. 6. 4.

the Jews, was of a very varied character. Tertullian speaks of Gentiles who, while observing several Jewish ordinances, continued notwithstanding to worship their own deities (see note 271). On the other hand, such of them as submitted to circumcision thereby bound themselves to observe the whole law to its fullest extent (Gal. v. 3: *μαρτύρομαι παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι*). Between those two extremes there would be, as we may well suppose, a manifold series of gradations. There is something very instructive, in this connection, in the fourteenth satire of Juvenal, where the poet enlarges on the thought as to the way in which children are injuriously affected by the evil example of their parents. The bad practices of the former, he tells us, are transmitted to the latter, and that, as a rule, in an intensified form. By way of giving an example of this in the domain of superstition, he mentions the *penchant* for Judaism. If the father spends every seventh day in indolence, and looks upon swine's flesh as being quite as precious as the flesh of man, then not only does the son do the same thing, but he even goes the length of submitting to be circumcised, and despises the Roman laws, and studies and reverently observes the Jewish law that has come down from Moses, and which teaches that they are never to point out the way to any but those of their own faith, nor show any one where to find a well, unless he is circumcised.²⁸⁹ From this it is plain that there must have been varying degrees of strictness on the part of Gentiles in regard to their observance of

²⁸⁹ Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv. 96-106:—

Quidam sortiti metuentem sabbata patrem,
 Nil praeter nubes et coeli numen adorant,
 Nec distare putant humana carne suillam,
 Qua pater obstinuit; mox et praepudia ponunt:
 Romanas autem soliti contemnere leges,
 Judaicum ediscunt et servant ac metuunt jus,
 Tradidit arcano quodcunque volumine Moses.

the Jewish law. For the proselytizing zeal of the Jews had just to content itself with what it could get. It was felt that much had been gained if any one could be so far converted as to worship the only true God, and that without the use of images. As regards the ceremonial law, only certain leading points were insisted on in the first instance. Thus the fourth book of the Sibylline oracles, for example, which was composed about the year 80 of our era, and is in all probability of Jewish origin, contains an address to the Gentiles, in which prominence is given only to the worship of the true God and the belief in a future judgment, while instead of requiring the converted Gentile to be circumcised, all that is asked is a bath of purification.^{289a} The history of the conversion of King Izates is also very instructive. This monarch was himself animated by a burning zeal for the Jewish law, and wanted to be circumcised. But a Jew of the name of Ananias ventured to interpose, and in the most urgent way possible tried to dissuade him. The Jew apprehended some danger to himself if the idea should get abroad that he had been the occasion of the king's being circumcised. Consequently he represented to this latter that he could worship God without being circumcised, provided he simply observed in a general way the ordinances of the Jews, this being of more importance than circumcision. He further pointed out to him that if, in deference to the feelings of his subjects, he were to omit this rite, God would certainly forgive him.²⁹⁰ Yet for all that Izates insisted on being circumcised; while unques-

Non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti,
 Quaesitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos.
 Sed pater in causa, cui septima quaeque fuit lux
 Ignava et partem vitae non attigit ullam.

^{289a} *Orac. Sibyll. iv. 164.* On the Jewish origin of this book, consult Badt, *Ursprung, Inhalt und Text des vierten Buches der sibyllinischen Orakel*, 1878, and notice of the same in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1878, p. 358 sq.

²⁹⁰ Joseph. *Antt. xx. 2. 5.*

tionably the views of the merchant Ananias were not those of an orthodox Jew. But there were evidently many who thought very much as he did in regard to those matters. The result of this was, that *to almost every one of the Jewish communities of the dispersion there was attached a following of "God-fearing" Gentiles* who adopted the Jewish (*i.e.* the monotheistic and imageless) mode of worship, attended the Jewish synagogues, but who, in the observance of the ceremonial law, restricted themselves to certain leading points, and so were regarded as outside the fellowship of the Jewish communities. It is God-fearing Gentiles of this description that are undoubtedly to be understood by the *φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν* or the *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν* so often mentioned in Josephus, and above all in the Acts of the Apostles.²⁹¹ Now if we ask ourselves what those points of the ceremonial law were which these Gentiles observed, we will find them plainly enough indicated in the passages already quoted from Josephus, Juvenal, and Tertullian (see notes 271 and 289). All three agree in this, that it was the Jewish observance of the Sabbath and the prescriptions with regard to meats that were in most general favour within the circles in question. And those are precisely the two points which Juvenal specially mentions in connection with the father of the son who outdoes his father by becoming a thoroughpaced Jew (*metuentem sabbata patrem*

²⁹¹ *φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν*, Acts x. 2, 22, xiii. 16, 26. *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν*, Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2; Acts xiii. 43, 50, xvi. 14, xvii. 4, xviii. 17, xix. 7. Here the form of expression varies between the fuller *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν* (Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2; Acts xvi. 14, xix. 7) and the simple *σεβόμενοι* (Acts xiii. 50, xvii. 4, xviii. 17). In one instance we meet with *σεβόμενοι* conjoined with *προσέλυτοι* (Acts xiii. 43). Bernays (*Commentationes philol. in honorem, Th. Mommseni*, p. 565) also compares the inscription, n. 88 in vol. v. 1 of *Corp. Inscr. Lat.*: Aur. Soteriae matri pientissimae religioni(s) judaicae metuenti. The forms of expression in Juvenal (*metuentem sabbata . . . Judaicum metuunt jus*), which Bernays also quotes in this connection, are however of an essentially different character. See in general, Deyling, *De σεβομενοις του θεου* (*Observationes sacrae*, ii. 462-469). Philo, *Codex apocryphus Nov. Test.* p. 521. Bernays as above.

. . . *carne suillam qua pater abstinnuit*). Then again compliance even with these would sometimes be of a more and sometimes of a less rigid character; it is hardly likely that here any hard and fast line would be observed. *From these φοβούμενοι or σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν we must now distinguish the םִיָּרִי or προσήλυτοι, strictly so called.* For with these latter expressions later Judaism meant to designate those Gentiles who, through circumcision and the observance of the law, became completely incorporated with the Jewish people. In the Old Testament, in its Hebrew and Greek form alike, the םִיָּרִי or the προσήλυτοι exactly correspond to the μέτοικοι in the Attic state—that is to say, they are regarded as strangers who have their permanent abode in the land of Israel, but without belonging to the fellowship of Israel (*advenae incolae*). But subsequent usage uniformly employed both terms, and that without further qualification, to denote those Gentiles who, through circumcision and the observance of the law, had been admitted into full religious fellowship with Israel.²⁹²

²⁹² In the Mishna םִיָּרִי is used in the sense given to it in the text in the following passages: *Demai* vi. 10; *Shebi'ith* x. 9; *Challa* iii. 6; *Bikkurim* i. 4–5; *Pesachim* viii. 8; *Shekalim* i. 3, 6, vii. 6; *Kethuboth* ix. 9; *Kiddushin* iv. 1, 6, 7; *Baba kamma* iv. 7, ix. 11; *Baba mezia* iv. 10; *Baba bathra* iii. 3, iv. 9; *Edujoth* v. 2; *Horajoth* i. 4, iii. 8; *Chullin* x. 4; *Kerithoth* ii. 1; *Nidda* vii. 3; *Sabim* ii. 1, 3; *Jadajim* iv. 4. The feminine םִיָּרִיָּה occurs in *Jebamoth* vi. 5, viii. 2, xi. 2; *Kethuboth* i. 2, 4, iii. 1, 2, iv. 3; *Kiddushin* iv. 7; *Baba kamma* v. 4; *Edujoth* v. 6. The use of םִיָּרִי in the sense of a converted stranger is so completely established that even a verb םִיָּרִיָּה = “to become a convert,” has been formed from it, and occurs in *Pea* iv. 6; *Shebi'ith* x. 9; *Challa* iii. 6; *Pesachim* viii. 8; *Jebamoth* ii. 8, xi. 2; *Kethuboth* i. 2, 4, iii. 1, 2, iv. 3, ix. 6; *Gittin* ii. 6; *Kiddushin* iii. 5; *Chullin* x. 4; *Bechoroth* viii. 1; *Negaim* vii. 1; *Sabim* ii. 3. The Aramaic form of םִיָּרִי is םִיָּרִיָּה, which also occurs twice in the Septuagint (*γειώρας*, *Ex.* xii. 19; *Isa.* xiv. 1), and in Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* chap. cxxii. (*γηόρας*); Schleusner's Lexicon for the Sept. under *γειώρας*, and Otto's note on Justin as above. In his history of the Jewish war Josephus makes frequent mention of ὁ τοῦ Γιώρα Σίμων. For the purpose of denoting the simple metoikos in the Old Testament sense of the word, the Mishna uses an expression which, like the former, is also found already in the Old Testa-

How great the number of those may have been we have no means of knowing. But one cannot be far wrong in estimating it to have been considerably smaller than that of the *σεβόμενοι*.

With those two classes, the *σεβόμενοι* on the one hand and the *προσήλυτοι* properly so called on the other, Christian scholars are uniformly in the habit of identifying two categories of an apparently kindred character that are met with in Rabbinical literature. It is quite usual to say (as was also done in the first edition of the present work), that the *σεβόμενοι* correspond to what in Rabbinical language are called "*proselytes of the gate*" (*גֵּרֵי הַשַּׁעַר*), and the *προσήλυτοι*, on the other hand, to what in the same language are known as "*proselytes of righteousness*" (*גֵּרֵי הַצְדִּיק*).²⁹³ In point

ment, viz. *גֵּר תַּשְׁבַּ*, *Baba mezia* v. 6, ix. 12; *Makkoth* ii. 3; *Negaim* iii. 1. The Greek *προσήλυτος* has also undergone the same changes of meaning as *גֵּר*. In later usage this too is no longer employed, as in the Septuagint, to denote an *advena* in the land of Israel, but a convert to the religion of Israel (a *νομίμοις* *προσεληλυθώς* τοῖς Ἰουδαϊκοῖς, *Antt.* xviii. 3. 5). It is so explained by Philo, who attaches to the Old Testament term the meaning current in his own day, when he says, *De monarchia*, i. § 7 (*Mang.* ii. 219): *τούτους δὲ καλεῖ προσήλυτους ἀπὸ τοῦ προσεληλυθέναι καινῇ καὶ φιλοθέῳ πολιτείᾳ κ.τ.λ.* Comp. also the fragment in the *Catenae* on *Ex.* xxii. 19, as quoted by *Mang.* ii. 677. *Suidas'* *Lex.* under the word explains as follows: *οἱ ἐξ ἐθνῶν προσεληλυθότες καὶ κατὰ νόμον ποθήσαντες πολιτεύεσθαι*. In the New Testament, *Matt.* xxiii. 15; *Acts* ii. 10, vi. 5, xiii. 43 (in the latter passage however the addition of *σεβόμενοι* precludes us from supposing that circumcised persons are in view). *Justin, Dial. c. Tryph.* chap. cxxii. *Irenaeus*, iii. 21. 1 (*Theodotion* and *Aquila*, ἀμφοτέροις Ἰουδαῖοι *προσήλυτοι*). *Tertullian, Adv. Judaeos*, chap. i. *Clemens Alexandr. Quis dives salvetur*, chap. xxviii. (*Dindorf*, iii. 405). *Inscription*, n. 2522 in *Orelli, Inscr. Lat.* (see note 276). Another inscription in *Engeström, Om Judarne i Rom* (*Upsala* 1876), p. 41 sq.: *Mannacius sorori Chrusidi dulcissime proselyti*. Instead of *προσήλυτος* we also find *ἐπήλυτος* by itself (*Philo, De monarchia*, book i. § 7 (ed. *Mang.* ii. 219). *Barnabae, Epist.* chap. iii. *fin.*).

²⁹³ So *Deyling*, for example, in the treatise mentioned above (note 291), *Wolf, Curae philol. in Nov. Test.*, note on *Acts* xiii. 16, and many subsequent writers. I am rather disposed to think that it was *Deyling* who originated this view. For I have not met with a single instance among writers previous to him in which the *σεβόμενοι* are regarded as being the same as the "*proselytes of the gate*."

of fact however it is only this latter part of the statement that is correct, the *σεβόμενοι* and the *גרי השער* having nothing whatever to do with each other. Those Rabbinical designations are as yet entirely foreign to the usage of the Mishna, where the only distinction met with is that between the *גֵּר* pure and simple and the *גֵּר תושב*. The former means a Gentile who has been converted to Judaism, the latter again corresponds to what in the Old Testament is understood by a *גֵּר*, namely a stranger dwelling in the land of Israel (see note 292). But with a view to greater clearness and precision it afterwards came to be the practice to substitute for *גֵּר* the expression *גֵּר צדק* (a *righteous* stranger, i.e. a stranger who observes the law), and for *גֵּר תושב* the words *גֵּר שער*, a *stranger dwelling in the gates or in the land of Israel* (according to Ex. xx. 10; Deut. v. 14, xiv. 21, xxiv. 14). The latter therefore corresponds exactly to what in the Old Testament is simply called a *גֵּר*. It would appear however that the expression *גֵּר שער* is as yet no less foreign to Talmudic usage. At least in all the passages from the Talmud that are quoted in any of the literature with which I happen to be acquainted, the only expression ever used is *גֵּר תושב*.²⁹⁴ It is not till we come down to the Rabbinical writers of the Middle Ages that we meet with the expression *גֵּר שער* as well.²⁹⁵ If then we confine ourselves to Talmudic usage the question is simply reduced to this, whether

²⁹⁴ So above all in *Sanhedrin* 96b: "Naeman (2 Kings v. 1) was a *גֵּר תושב*; Nebuzaradan (2 Kings xxv. 8) was a *גֵּר צדק*" (Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 410). Similarly in all the other passages from the Talmud quoted, for example, by Buxtorf (*Lex.* under *גֵּר*), Levy (*Neuhebr. Wörterb.* under *גֵּר*), Hamburger (*Real-Enc.* art. "Proselyt") and others, the only expressions met with are *גֵּר תושב* and *גֵּר צדק*.

²⁹⁵ When one peruses modern treatises on this subject, one is led to suppose that the expression *גֵּר שער* was quite current. But throughout the whole of the literature with which I am acquainted I have not been able to discover more than one solitary instance of it, namely R. Bechai (belonging to the thirteenth century) in his *Kad ha-Kemach* as quoted in Buxtorf's *Lex.* col. 410.

the *σεβόμενοι* are to be regarded as identical with the *גרי חשב*. Now with regard to these latter the Talmud states that they were those who had come under an obligation to observe "the seven precepts of the children of Noah."²⁹⁶ Under this designation the Talmudic doctors include all those precepts that were already binding upon mankind at large before Abraham and outside of his family (in other words, the "children of Noah").²⁹⁷ If then compliance with these latter

²⁹⁶ *Aboda sara* 64_b: "What is a *גר חשב*? According to R. Meir, every one who, in the presence of the Chaberim, comes under an obligation to abstain from all idolatrous worship. But the doctors say: Every one that accepts the seven precepts which were accepted by the descendants of Noah (*בני נח*). Others say: A *גר חשב* is a stranger who eats the carcase of an animal that has died a natural death (*נבלות*, Lev. xxii. 8; Deut. xiv. 21); who observes all the precepts of the law except that which forbids the eating of fallen meat." See also Buxtorf, *Lex.* col. 409. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 941 (art. "Proselyt"). Slevogt, *De proselytis Judaeorum*, chap. xli., in Ugolini, *Thes.* xxii. 842 (and here according to Maimonides). Leyrer in Herzog's *Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. xii. p. 250. Delitzsch, also in Herzog, 2nd ed. vol. xii. p. 300.

²⁹⁷ *Sanhedrin* 56_b top: "There were seven precepts given to the descendants of Noah (*בני נח*): (1) *דינין* (to obey those in authority), (2) *ברכת השם* (to sanctify the name of God), (3) *עבודה זרה* (to abstain from idolatry), (4) *גילוי ערויות* (to commit no fornication), (5) *שפיכות דמים* (to do no murder), (6) *גזל* (not to steal), (7) *אכר מן החי* (not to eat living flesh, i.e. flesh with the blood in it)." For this same enumeration, see Tosefta, *Aboda sara* ix. In several passages of the Mishna (for example *Bereshith rabba*, chap. xvi. *fin.* given in Wünsche, *Der Midrash Bereshith rabba ins Deutsche übertragen*, 1881, p. 72) only the first six are enumerated as belonging to the Noachian precepts, which are further said to have been already given to Adam himself (see Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* under *מצוה*; Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*, p. 253 sq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* art. "Noachiden," p. 864). Hence Maimonides affirms that the first six were given to Adam and that the sixth was added in Noah's time. Moreover mention is likewise made of thirty precepts that had been given to the Noachidae, but of which they only observed three (*Chullin* 92^a bottom; see Waehner, *Antiqui Ebr.* ii. 163. Hamburger as above, p. 865). See in general, Slevogt, *De proselytis Judaeorum*, chap. xl. (in Ugolini, *Thes.* xxii. 841 sq.). Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 268 sqq. Deyling, *Observationes sacrae*, ii. No. 38, p. 464, ed. Lips. 1722 (also other literature mentioned there). Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, p. 40 sq. (also other literature mentioned there). Waehner, *Antiquitates Ebraeorum*, ii. p. 163 sq

was what was demanded of the גֵּר הַיָּשֵׁב, *this can only mean that one who was not a Jew, but who lived permanently in the land of Israel, had at least to observe those precepts that were equally binding on the whole human race.* Of course this proved to be nothing more than a barren theory. For it is hardly likely that the Greeks and Romans who lived in Palestine would trouble themselves much about those Jewish regulations. So far then as practical life is concerned the so-called precepts for proselytes have no significance. They only represent a casuistical theory which was never reduced to actual practice.²⁹⁸ From this therefore it is evident that the גֵּר הַיָּשֵׁב have no connection with the *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν*, just as it is further certain that what we know from history regarding these latter is utterly incompatible with the Rabbinical requirements in regard to the גֵּר הַיָּשֵׁב.

It would appear, according to the Talmud, that on the occasion of admitting proselytes strictly so called into the Jewish communion *three things were necessary*: (1) מִילָה, circumcision; (2) מְבִילָה, baptism, *i.e.* a bath with a view to Levitical purification; and (3) הִרְצָאת דָּמִים, a sacrifice (literally, ■ gracious acceptance of blood). In the case of women only the last two were required.²⁹⁹ After the destruction of the

Leyrer in Herzog's *Enc.*, 1st ed. xii. 250. Delitzsch, also in Herzog, 2nd ed. xii. 300. Weber, *System*, etc. p. 253 sq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. pp. 863-866 (art. "Noachiden").

²⁹⁸ Besides, as the passage quoted from *Aboda sara* 64^b shows, the theory was thrown together only in an off-hand way, it was not seriously thought out. A more careful comparison of the Old Testament regulations with regard to the גֵּרִים would have led to different results (see in general, Ex. xii. 43-50, xx. 10, xxii. 20, xxiii. 9, 12; Lev. xvii. 8, 10, 13, 15, xviii. 26, xix. 10, 33, 34, xx. 2, xxiv. 16-22; Num. xv. 14-16, xix. 10; Deut. v. 14, xiv. 21, xxiv. 14; Ezek. xiv. 7). We see then that the Jewish doctors cannot have dealt with this matter *ex professo*. Further, the various answers given to the question raised in *Aboda sara* 64^b, go to show that we have to do merely with a view incidentally expressed and not with a firmly established practice.

²⁹⁹ *Kerithoth* 81^a (according to other editions 9^a; it is by way of serving

temple, as a matter of course the sacrifice was discontinued also. In the Mishna all three are presupposed as being already of long standing;³⁰⁰ nay for Rabbinical Judaism they are so much matters of course that, even apart from any explicit testimony, we should have had to assume that they were already currently practised in the time of Christ. For as no Jew could be admitted into fellowship with Israel except through circumcision, so it was quite as much a matter of course that a Gentile, who as such was unclean, seeing that he was not in the habit of observing the regulations with regard to Levitical purity, should be required, on entering into such fellowship, to take the bath of Levitical purification. But similarly, a Gentile as such was also *מְחַפֵּר בַּפֶּה*, "in need of atonement," and con-

as an explanation of Mishna, *Kerithoth* ii. 1): "Your fathers entered not otherwise into the covenant than by *circumcision, washing with water, and the offering* (literally, gracious acceptance) *of blood.*" See the passage also in Selden, *De Synedriis*, book i. chap. iii. (vol. i. p. 34 of London edition), in Bengel, *Ueber das Alter der jüd. Proselytentaufe*, p. 20, and in Schneckenburger, *Ueber das Alter der jüdischen Proselytentaufe*, p. 138. *Jebamoth* 46^a: לעולם אין גר עד שימול ויטבול, "A proselyte only becomes so after he has been circumcised and has been washed with water. . . . With regard to a proselyte who has been circumcised but not washed with water, R. Eliezer says that he is a proselyte notwithstanding; for we find that, in the case of our fathers, they were circumcised but not washed with water. With regard to one who has been washed with water but not circumcised, R. Joshua says that he is a proselyte notwithstanding, for we find that, in the case of our mothers, they were washed with water but not circumcised. But the doctors say that neither the one nor the other is a proselyte." See the passage also in Selden, *De Synedriis*, book i. chap. iii. (vol. i. p. 35 of London edition), in Bengel as above, p. 22, and in Schneckenburger as above, p. 136 sq. Founding on those Talmudical prescriptions, Maimonides likewise affirms that three things are necessary, *קרנן* and *מילה* and *טבילה*, it being expressly stated that the two last are binding upon women. See the passage in Selden, *De Synedriis*, book i. chap. iii. (vol. i. pp. 37-40 of London edition). Also in general Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* note on Matt. iii. 6. Slevogt, *De proselytis*, chap. xi. (Ugolini, xxii. 815). Danz, *Baptismus proselytorum*, chap. xvi. (in Meuschen, *Nov. Test.* etc. p. 250) Carpzov, *Apparatus*, p. 43. Leyrer in Herzog's *Enc.* xii. 242 sqq.

³⁰⁰ Circumcision and washing with water (baptism), *Pesachim* viii. 8= *Edujoth* v. 2. Sacrifice, *Kerithoth* ii. 1.

tinued to be so "until blood was sprinkled for him."³⁰¹ Strange to say, with regard to one of the things here in question, namely the *baptism* or washing with water, the view has prevailed among Christian scholars since the beginning of the eighteenth century, that it was not observed as yet in our Lord's time. Originally it was for dogmatic reasons that this was maintained, while in modern times nothing but an imperfect acquaintance with the facts of the case can account for the way in which the once dominant prejudice has been allowed to linger on.³⁰² Surely every one in the least acquainted with Pharisaic Judaism must know how frequently a native Jew was compelled, in accordance with the enactments of Lev. xi.-xv. and Num. xix., to take a bath with a view to Levitical purification. As Tertullian justly observes,

³⁰¹ *Kerithoth* ii. 1.

³⁰² Lists of the literature of this subject are given by Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, p. 46 sq. Bengel, *Ueber das Alter der jüd. Proselytentaufer*, pp. 1-13. Schneckenburger, *Ueber das Alter der jüdischen Proselyten-Taufer*, pp. 4-32. Winer, *Realwörterb.* ii. 286 (art. "Proselyten"). Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* xii. 245. De Wette, *Lehrbuch der hebräisch-jüdischen Archäologie*, 4th ed. (1864) p. 376. Meyer's *Commentary*, note on Matt. iii. 6. The following works deserve special mention: Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebr.*, note on Matt. iii. 6. Danz, *Baptismus proselytorum Judaicus* (in Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, pp. 233-287). Idem, *Antiquitas baptismi initiationis Israelitarum vindicata* (also in Meuschen, pp. 287-305). Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, pp. 46-50. Bengel, *Ueber das Alter der jüd. Proselytentaufer*, Tübingen 1814. Schneckenburger, *Ueber das Alter der jüd. Proselyten-Taufer und deren Zusammenhang mit dem Johanneischen und christlichen Ritus*, Berlin 1828. Lübker, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, p. 690 sqq. Winer, *Realwörterb.* ii. 285 sq. Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. xii. pp. 242-249. Delitzsch, *ibid.* 2nd ed. xii. pp. 297-299. Zezschwitz, *System der christl. kirchl. Katechetik*, i. 216 sqq. Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (2nd ed. 1884), pp. 745-747. Of the above, Lightfoot, Danz, Bengel, Delitzsch, Zezschwitz, Edersheim are in favour of the high antiquity of the baptism of proselytes, the others are opposed to it; but none of them have influenced modern opinion on the subject so much as Schneckenburger.

"Judæus quotidie lavat quia quotidie inquinatur."³⁰³ But a Gentile, not being in the habit of observing those regulations with regard to Levitical purity, would as such be unclean and that as a simple matter of course. In that case how was it possible that he could be admitted into Jewish communion without his having first of all subjected himself to a כְּבִיֵּלָה (a Levitical "bath of purification")? This general consideration is of itself so conclusive that there is no need to lay any very great stress upon individual testimonies. But we may further add, that it is an unmistakeable fact that, in the Mishna, the taking of the "bath" by the proselyte is already presupposed as an established and authoritative practice.³⁰⁴ In like manner the celebrated passage from Arrian (first half of the second century of our era) cannot, in my opinion, be otherwise under-

³⁰³ Tertullian, *De baptismo*, chap. xv.

³⁰⁴ *Pesachim* viii. 8 (= *Edujoth* v. 2): "A mourner is at liberty to partake of the Passover lamb that very evening after he has washed, but not so with regard to other holy sacrifices. . . . If a Gentile should happen to be circumcised on the day previous to the Passover, then, says the school of Shammai, he is at liberty (on that same day) to wash and, in the evening, partake of the Passover lamb (טובל ואוכל את פסחו לערב); but the school of Hillel says: whoever comes from being circumcised is like one who comes from a grave" (from touching a dead body). According to Gabler, the proselyte's bath mentioned here was prescribed "because the proselyte was defiled by the act of circumcision (!), and because among the Jews an unclean person was strictly speaking forbidden to take part in the Passover meal" (Gabler, *Journal für auserlesene theologische Literatur*, second part of the third vol., Nürnberg 1807, pp. 436-440). Similarly Bengel, *Proselytentaufe*, p. 90, note. Schneckenburger, p. 116 sqq. Winer, *Realwörterb.* ii. 286. Leyrer, xii. 246. If this notion of a defilement caused by circumcision were correct, then the prescription as to the bath would apply to every proselyte without distinction, no matter whether he was circumcised on the 4th of Nisan or at any other time. But the truth is the bath is presupposed as a matter of course, for the simple reason that a Gentile as such was unclean; and the only point in dispute is whether an exception was made in favour of one who was circumcised on the 14th of Nisan, so as to admit of his being treated as one who was unclean only for a single day in order that he might not be disqualified for joining in the Passover feast,

stood than as referring to the baptism of proselytes.³⁰⁵ Again, the fourth book of the *Sibylline Oracles*, the Jewish origin of which is at least probable, insists on converted Gentiles being baptized as an outward token of their conversion.³⁰⁶ The two last-mentioned testimonies are specially noteworthy on this account, that they speak only of the baptism and say nothing whatever about the circumcision. From this it follows that even in those cases where *full* admission to the fellowship of Israel had not taken place, the baptism at least was regarded as necessary. In presence of all those arguments the silence of Philo and Josephus on which so much stress has been laid is of no consequence whatever. For as yet no one has ever been able to point out a single passage in which those writers were necessarily called upon to mention the matter. Then in modern times some have gone the length of admitting that proselytes, on joining the Jewish communion, had

or whether in this instance as well the rule was enforced which required him to be treated as one who was unclean in the higher degree, and therefore for a period of seven days ("like one who comes from a grave," according to Num. xix.). Comp. Delitzsch as above, xii. 299.

³⁰⁵ Arrian, *Dissertat. Epicteti*, ii. 9: "Ὅταν τινα ἐπαμφοτερίζοντα εἶδωμεν, εἰώθαμεν λέγειν· οὐκ ἔστιν Ἰουδαῖος, ἀλλ' ὑποκρίνεται. Ὅταν δ' ἀναλάβῃ τὸ πάθος τὸ τοῦ βεβαμμένου καὶ ἡρημένου, τότε καὶ ἔστι τῷ ὄντι καὶ καλεῖται Ἰουδαῖος. Here Arrian seeks to show that a man can claim to be a true philosopher only when his practice is in accordance with his principles. He intimates that there was something analogous to this in the case of the Jews. If a man calls himself a Jew without living as such, he is not recognised as a Jew. "But if any one adopts the mode of life required of one who has been baptized and elected (received into religious fellowship), then is he really a Jew and entitled to be called such." The figurative sense of *βεβαμμένου* (initiated) is here quite as improbable as the notion that Arrian confounds Jews with Christians. Comp. especially the exhaustive treatment of the matter in Bengel, pp. 91-99. But Schneckenburger's interpretation: "the *πάθος* of one who must regularly bathe himself" (p. 86, and in general pp. 78-89), is precluded by the use of the *perfect*.

³⁰⁶ *Orac. Sibyll.* iv. 164.

to take a bath of Levitical purification. But this they think was something different from "baptism."³⁰⁷ Unfortunately, however, no one is able to say wherein the difference lies. The truth is, it lies only in the German expression. For in Hebrew they are, as regards both the name and the thing, one and the same, namely a *מְבִילָה*, and, so far as the essence of this latter is concerned, it mattered very little whether it was accompanied with a larger or a smaller amount of liturgical ceremonial.³⁰⁸

The *obligations and rights of the proselytes* have been defined with great minuteness and detail by the Jewish doctors.³⁰⁹ Speaking generally it was regarded, according to orthodox Pharisaic views, as a simple matter of course that they should *observe the whole law* (Gal. v. 3), and so also in particular with regard to the sacred tribute.³¹⁰ But the doctors have

³⁰⁷ So for example Winer, *Realwörtl.* ii. 286. Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* xii. 247. Keil, *Bibl. Archäol.*, 2nd ed. (1875) p. 341. Besides these also Schneckenburger, pp. 176, 184 sq.

³⁰⁸ For a description of the rite as observed in post-Talmudic times, see for example Buxtorf, *Lex.* col. 407 sq. Slevogt, *De proselytis*, chap. xiii. (in Ugolini, *Thes.* xxii. 817 sq.). Delitzsch in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. xii. 297. The most essential thing there was the presence of witnesses, which we may confidently assume would be regarded as no less necessary in pre-Talmudic times as well. And what is more, the Talmud, so far as I am aware, contains as yet no precise account of the ceremonial. It is therefore purely gratuitous to assert that the *מְבִילָה* mentioned in the Talmud is different from that mentioned in the Mishna. On the other hand, it is correct to say that *the baptism of John and Christian baptism* are essentially different from that of the Jewish proselytes, and that because the two former were not intended to impart *Levitical* purity, but merely to serve as a symbol of moral cleansing. But of course the choice of this symbol was suggested by the practice of the Jews in regard to washings.

³⁰⁹ For the passages in the Mishna, see note 292, above. A collection of material from the Talmud and Midrash is given in the tractate *Gerim*, to be found in the *Septem libri Talmudici parvi Hierosolymitani*, Frankfurt-am-Ma. 1851, and edited by Raphael Kirchheim.

³¹⁰ *Bikkurim* i. 4; *Shekalim* i. 3, 6; *Pea* iv. 6; *Challa* iii. 6; *Chulin* x. 4.

here taxed their ingenuity in the way of carefully laying down certain limitations, especially in regard to the *terminus a quo* at which the obligation comes to be in force. Only those portions of the proselyte's earnings were liable for tribute which fell under the category of liability after his conversion.³¹¹ Brothers who were born previous to their mother's conversion were not subject to the law regarding levirate marriage.³¹² Then maidens who were born before their mother's conversion were not to be bound by the law given in Deut. xxii. 13-21.³¹³ This latter regulation may of itself serve to show how, along with the limitation of obligations, there was also at the same time a limitation of rights. Then again it was only such female proselytes as were less than three years and a day old at the time of the mother's conversion that, with respect to numerous matrimonial rights, were on a footing of equality with native Jewish women.³¹⁴ Further, female proselytes were on no account to be at liberty to contract marriage with priests, nor were the daughters of proselytes to be allowed to do so except in those instances in which one of the parents happened to be an Israelite by birth, in which case the privilege extended to the tenth generation.³¹⁵ On the other hand, proselyte women might marry a person that had been emasculated or mutilated, a thing which, according to Deut. xxiii. 2, native Jewesses were debarred from doing.³¹⁶ Then the legal enactment to the effect that, if any one through carelessness happened to strike a woman in such a way as to cause abortion he was to give compensation, did not apply to the case of proselyte women.³¹⁷ But, on the other hand, the

³¹¹ *Pea* iv. 6; *Challa* iii. 6; *Chullin* x. 4.

³¹² *Jebamoth* xi. 2.

³¹³ *Kethuboth* iv. 3.

³¹⁴ *Kethuboth* i. 2, 4, iii. 1, 2.

³¹⁵ *Jebamoth* vi. 5; *Kiddushin* iv. 7; *Bikkurim* i. 5.

³¹⁶ *Jebamoth* viii. 2.

³¹⁷ *Baba kamma* v. 4.

law with reference to the drinking of the jealousy water (Num. v. 11 sqq.) applied to female proselytes as well.³¹⁸

It is precisely the care with which those restrictions have been framed that is so well calculated to show that, *in regard to obligations and rights, proselytes were regarded as being in all essential respects on an equality with native Israelites.* At the same time the gulf that lay between a born Gentile and a genuine descendant of Abraham could never be bridged over. A proselyte was never allowed to call the fathers of Israel "his" fathers;³¹⁹ while, in the order of rank in the theocracy, a proselyte occupies a lower place even than a nathin.³²⁰ Although with characteristic humaneness the Jewish law, appealing to Ex. xxii. 20, forbids any one ever to be so unkind as to remind the son of a proselyte of the past ways of his fathers,³²¹ still, on the whole, proselytes were never held in the same estimation as native Jews. What Rabbi Judah presupposes with respect to the proselytes in Rekem, that they must have been remiss in the observance of the law,³²² probably represented, and that not altogether without reason, the average opinion held regarding them, and accordingly there are frequent complaints about them in the Talmud.

According to the Deuteronomic legislation there were two nations, the Ammonites and the Moabites, that were never

³¹⁸ *Edujoth* v. 6.

³¹⁹ *Bikkurim* i. 4: "A proselyte offers his firstlings without repeating the confession, Deut. xxvi. 3 sqq., because he is not at liberty to say, Give us what Thou hast sworn to *our* fathers. But if his mother happens to be of Israel, in that case he repeats the confession. When such proselyte prays by himself he uses the words, The God of the fathers of Israel. And when he is in the synagogue he uses the words, The God of *your* fathers. But if his mother be of Israel he says, The God of *our* fathers."

³²⁰ *Horajoth* iii. 8: "A priest (in point of rank) takes precedence of a Levite, a Levite of an Israelite, an Israelite of a bastard, a bastard of a נתין, a nathin of a proselyte, and a proselyte of an emancipated slave."

³²¹ *Baba mezia* iv. 10.

³²² *Nidda* vii. 3.

to be admitted into communion with Israel, no, not even in the tenth generation (Deut. xxiii. 4). It is said that, apropos of this enactment, the question was once debated in the time of Gamaliel II., whether an Ammonitish proselyte who might wish to join the communion of the Jews should be allowed to do so. Gamaliel decided in the negative, while R. Joshua took the affirmative view on the ground that the Ammonites had long ceased to exist. The view of R. Joshua was homologated by the learned doctors.³²³

³²³ *Jadajim* iv. 4.

END OF DIV. II. VOL. I

A HISTORY
OF
THE JEWISH PEOPLE
IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST

BY THE LATE
PROFESSOR EMIL SCHÜRER, D.D.

AUTHORISED ENGLISH TRANSLATION

COMPLETE IN TWO VOLUMES
EACH COMPRISING ONE DIVISION
(INDEX VOLUME ADDITIONAL)

SECOND DIVISION

(THREE VOLUMES IN ONE)

THE INTERNAL CONDITION OF PALESTINE, AND OF
THE JEWISH PEOPLE, IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST

VOL. III

EDINBURGH : T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH
LONDON : SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED
NEW YORK : CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

<i>Printed</i>	<i>May</i>	1886
<i>Reprinted</i>	<i>June</i>	1891
"	<i>May</i>	1892
"	<i>July</i>	1895
"	<i>July</i>	1897
"	<i>May</i>	1900
"	<i>April</i>	1902
"	<i>October</i>	1905
"	<i>September</i>	1910
"	<i>December</i>	1914
"	<i>July</i>	1922
"	<i>January</i>	1924

CONTENTS OF DIVISION II. VOL. III.

	PAGE
§ 32. THE PALESTINIAN-JEWISH LITERATURE,	1
I. Historiography,	6
1. The First Book of Maccabees,	6
2. The History of John Hyrcanus,	13
3. Josephus' History of the Jewish War,	14
II. The Psalmodic Literature,	15
1. The Psalms of the Maccabaeon Age,	15
2. The Psalms of Solomon,	17
III. The Gnostic Wisdom,	23
1. Jesus the Son of Sirach,	23
2. The Pirke Aboth,	30
IV. Hortatory Narrative,	32
1. The Book of Judith,	32
2. The Book of Tobit,	37
V. Pseudepigraphic Prophecies,	44
1. The Book of Daniel,	44
2. The Book of Enoch,	59
3. The Assumptio Mosis,	73
4. The Apocalypse of Baruch,	83
5. The Fourth Book of Ezra,	93
6. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,	114
7. The Lost Pseudepigraphic Prophecies,	124
VI. The Sacred Legends,	133
1. The Book of Jubilees,	134
2. The Martyrdom of Isaiah,	141
3. The Lost Legendary Works: The Books of Adam— Abraham — Moses and his Time — (Jannes and Jambres),	146
VII. Books of Magic and Magical Spells,	151
§ 33. THE GRAECO-JEWISH LITERATURE,	156
I. Translations of Holy Scriptures,	159
1. The Septuagint,	159
2. Aquila and Theodotion,	168
II. Revision and Completion of Scripture Literature,	175
1. The Greek Ezra,	177
2. Additions to Esther,	181

	PAGE
3. Additions to Daniel,	183
4. The Prayer of Manasseh,	188
5. The Book of Baruch,	188
6. The Letter of Jeremiah,	195
III. Historical Literature,	195
1. Demetrius,	200
2. Eupolemus,	203
3. Artapanus,	206
4. Aristeas,	208
5. Cleodemus or Malchus,	209
6. An Anonymous Writer,	210
7. Jason of Cyrene and the Second Book of Maccabees,	211
8. The Third Book of Maccabees,	216
9. Philo's Historical Works,	219
10. Josephus,	221
11. Justus of Tiberias,	222
IV. Epic and Dramatic Poetry,	222
1. Philo, the Epic Poet,	222
2. Theodotus,	224
3. Ezekiel, the Tragic Poet. . . .	225
V. Philosophy,	228
1. The Wisdom of Solomon,	230
2. Aristobulus,	237
3. Philo,	243
4. The Fourth Book of Maccabees,	244
VI. Apologetic,	248
1. The Literary Opponents—Manetho—Apollonius Molon —Lysimachus—Chaeremon—Apion,	249
2. Apologetic,	262
VII. Jewish Propaganda under a Heathen Mask,	270
1. The Sibyllines,	271
2. Hystaspes,	292
3. Spurious Verses of Greek Poets,	294
4. Hecataeus,	302
5. Aristaeus,	306
6. Phocylides,	313
7. Smaller Pieces perhaps of Jewish Origin under Heathen Names,	316
§ 34. PHILO, THE JEWISH PHILOSOPHER,	321
1. Philo's Life and Works,	321
2. Philo's Doctrine,	362

§ 92. THE PALESTINIAN JEWISH LITERATURE.

Preliminary Observations.

UNQUESTIONABLE as it is on the one hand that zeal for the law of God and the hope of a better future constituted the two distinctive marks of the Judaism of the period now under consideration, still it must not be forgotten on the other that those interests sought to express themselves in a great variety of forms, and that, in the sphere of the spiritual life, there were yet other aims that claimed to rank along with them, though having no immediate connection with them. How far this was the case may be seen from a glance at the *Jewish literature* of our period. *The aspect which that literature presents is of so diversified a character* that it is difficult to combine all the different elements into one connected whole. And if this be true of the literature of Palestinian Judaism alone, it becomes much more so if we take into account the literature of Hellenistic Judaism as well. In that case there will be seen to stretch before us a field of so extensive and varied a character that it is scarcely any longer possible to make out the internal connection between all the various products of this literature.

In this strangely varied mass *two leading groups* may in the first instance be distinguished, the Palestinian and the Hellenistic. We select those designations for want of better; and to correspond with them we also divide our subject into two leading sections. But, at the same time, it must be distinctly borne in mind *that the line of demarcation between those two groups is of a somewhat fluctuating and indefinite character, and that the designations applied to them are to be*

taken very much cum grano salis. By the Palestinian Jewish literature we mean that which, in all essential (but only essential) respects, represents the standpoint of Pharisaic Judaism as it had developed itself in Palestine; while by the Hellenistic Jewish literature again we mean that which, either as regards form or matter, bears traces, to any noticeable extent, of Hellenistic influences. The products belonging to the first-mentioned group were for the most part composed in Hebrew; but the fact of their having been so composed must not be regarded as a decisive criterion, and that for the simple reason that, in numerous instances, it is no longer possible to make out whether it was Hebrew or Greek that was the original language, but further because, in the case of several compositions, the circumstance of their being written in Greek is a thing purely external and accidental. And hence it is that we also include in this group several writings that possibly, nay probably, were composed in Greek at the very first, while reserving for the other group only those that show pretty evident traces of Hellenistic influence either in the form or the matter. But the line of demarcation between the two cannot be sharply defined, there being in fact some writings that have almost as much title to be included in the one group as in the other. And just as the distinction we have adopted is not intended to imply that those belonging to the one group were written in Hebrew and those belonging to the other in Greek, so as little do we intend it to be understood by our use of the term "Palestinian" that all the compositions included under this designation were written in Palestine. For there was Palestinian Judaism outside of Palestine, just as conversely there was Hellenistic Judaism within it.

In the period now under consideration, literary efforts as such were essentially foreign to "*Palestinian*" Judaism. One might almost venture to say that it had no literature at all. For the few literary productions of which it could boast had, for the most part, a purely practical aim, and had but a

very slender connection with each other. *It is precisely from these writings themselves that we can see how true it is that zeal for the law and for the faith of the fathers eclipsed every other interest. When any one took to writing he did so as a rule for the purpose of, in one form or another, exhorting his readers to keep firm hold of those precious blessings, or of indirectly helping to increase and strengthen a spirit of faithful devotion to the law. Literary pursuits as such, and the cultivation of literature in the interests of culture generally, were things quite unknown to genuine Judaism. Its "culture" consisted in the knowledge and observance of the law.*

Looked at from this standpoint, it was a somewhat extraordinary thing to find that, in the palmy days of the Hasmonaeen dynasty, works of *native history* had been composed (*the First Book of Maccabees, the Chronicles of Hircanus*). This presupposed the existence of a patriotic self-consciousness, for which native history as such was a thing of some value. Later on, after the Hasmonaeen dynasty had been overthrown, we no longer meet with any further traces of Jewish historiography such as those now referred to; and so for his information with regard to this period Josephus had to depend on other than Jewish sources. We already begin to notice indications of an intimate connection with the aims of legal Judaism in those *Psalms* that were composed during this period in imitation of the older models (*the Maccabaean Psalms, the Psalter of Solomon*). The whole of those compositions were written with a view to religious edification, and therefore—for at that time religion meant simply a firm adherence to the law—more or less with the view of fostering and quickening a spirit of faithful devotion to the law. In our period, what is known as *gnomic wisdom* exercised a direct influence in the way of promoting the spirit in question. For notwithstanding the very diversified character of the wisdom of life exhibited in the proverbs of Jesus the son of Sirach, their alpha and omega is simply this: fear God and keep His commandments. Then in the maxims of the scribes of the

time of the Mishna, and which have been collected in the *Pirke Aboth*, we hear from beginning to end and in every variety of tone the exhortation to a strict observance of the law. But there was a species of literature of a totally different character that also served precisely the same end, viz. the *hortatory narrative* (*Judith, Tobit*). When, in compositions of this class, we have brought before us, in a somewhat imaginative fashion, the doings and the fortunes of persons who had been distinguished for their heroic faith or their exemplary piety, and who had at the same time been sustained by the divine help, the object of the story is not to entertain the reader, but to inculcate the truth that the fear of God is the highest wisdom, and that a fear of God in the sense of legal Pharisaic Judaism. But in our period a more favourite kind of literature still than the hortatory narrative was the genuine *prophetic exhortation*, i.e. exhortations based upon alleged special revelations with regard to the future destinies of the people. It was a favourite practice to put such revelations in the mouths of the recognised authorities of the olden time, with the view of thereby giving peculiar weight to the exhortations and the consolations based upon them. The object therefore of those *pseudepigraphic prophetic compositions* (*Daniel, Enoch, The Ascension of Moses, The Apocalypse of Baruch, The Apocalypse of Ezra, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and others*) was always of an eminently practical kind, viz. consolation amid the sufferings of the present, and encouragement to maintain a steadfast adherence to the law by pointing to the certainty of future rewards and punishments. None of those literary productions could be said to have had any direct connection with the professional labours of the scribes. No doubt they served to promote a spirit of faithful devotion to the law, but they had no concern with the law and the Holy Scriptures as such; we should rather regard them as free literary productions of a very diversified character, and composed for the most part in imitation of the older models. In the period now in question

the labours of the scribes, labours which concerned themselves with the text of the Holy Scriptures and with the work of forming new adaptations of that text either on its legal or its historical and dogmatic side, were as yet chiefly of an oral kind. This holds true above all with regard to the process of *adaptation as applied to the law*. It was not till toward the close of our period, in the time of R. Akiba, that the results of these learned adaptations of the law began to be committed to writing (see Div. ii. vol. i. p. 376).¹ On the other hand however there undoubtedly existed as early as our period *literary adaptations or reconstructions of sacred history* framed in the spirit of scribism. The Book of Chronicles may be taken as a case in point, inasmuch as it treats the earlier history of Israel in such a way as to make it accord with the ideals of later Judaism (see Div. ii. vol. i. p. 339). But we have a classical example of the Haggadic Midrash in the *Book of Jubilees*, which in any case falls within the period with which we are here dealing. It reconstructs the history of the canonical Book of Genesis entirely after the fashion of the Rabbinical Midrash. Other literary productions, which in all probability fall no less within our period, select certain episodes or personages from sacred history around which they seek to shed a halo of glory by means of fictitious legends (the Books of Adam, the History of Jannes and Jambres, and others). It would appear however that, at first, Hellenistic did more in this way than Rabbinical Judaism. For this latter the palmy

¹ Epiphanius no doubt repeatedly mentions a *Mishna of the Hasmonaeans* (*Haer.* xxxiii. 9 : δευτέρωσις . . . τῶν υἱῶν Ἀσασμωναίου, also *Haer.* xv., and similarly *Haer.* xlii. p. 332, ed. Petav.). But the notice in question is of so confused a character that it does not admit of being used for historical purposes. There is also some degree of obscurity about the statement in the *Megillath Taanith* to the effect that on the 14th of Tammuz "*the Book of the Decrees*" (ספר גזירותא) had been abolished (Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, pp. 103, 443, 445 ; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 3rd ed. iii. 606). According to the ordinary view a Sadducean penal code is supposed to be meant. At all events we have no undoubted evidence to show that, previous to the time of Akiba, the Pharisaic legal traditions had been committed to writing.

days of haggadean fiction did not begin till the Talmudic age. The object of those modifications or embellishments of sacred history was now no longer of so directly practical a character as it had been in the case of the majority of the writings previously mentioned. They owed their origin in the first instance to the universal interest that was taken in the sacred history generally, to the desire to have as exact and complete and accurate an acquaintance with it as possible, in connection with which however the tendency to embellish it also began at once to assert itself. And yet this tendency again had now in like manner an ulterior practical aim. In thus throwing around the sacred history as bright a halo as possible, the object was to show to what an extent Israel had from time to time been enjoying the miraculous protection of its God, but above all how, by their exemplary conduct and wonderful exploits, the holy patriarchs had proved themselves to be true men of God.

Thus we see then that it was objects chiefly of a practical kind that the literary efforts of Palestinian Judaism sought to serve. This was at least true of the department of history, with the consideration of which we will now enter upon our present subject.

I. HISTORIOGRAPHY.

1. *The First Book of Maccabees.*

Short notices of the Maccabaeen rising, and of the brothers Judas, Jonathan and Simon Maccabaeus, who played so prominent a part in it, must have been committed to writing shortly after the events themselves. For it is simply impossible that any writer living two generations after could have been so well informed with regard to those events as we find the author of the First Book of Maccabees to be unless he had been able to avail himself of existing written sources.²

² We have probably an allusion to those sources in 1 Macc. ix. 22: *καὶ ἐὰν περισσὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰούδα καὶ τῶν πολέμων καὶ τῶν ἀνδραγαθῶν ᾗ*

Those *sources of the First Book of Maccabees* — though we know nothing further of their origin and nature—are therefore entitled to foremost mention in any complete list of the historical literature of our period.

Our *First Book of Maccabees* itself gives a connected, minute and graphic narrative of the events that led to the Maccabæan rising, then of the course of the rising itself, particularly of the exploits and fortunes of Judas Maccabæus. It then proceeds to give the further history of the patriotic enterprises of the Jews, under the leadership of Jonathan, the brother of Judas, and of the institution of the Hasmonæan high priesthood and the founding of Jewish independence by the former. Then lastly we have an account of Simon, Jonathan's brother and successor who, by establishing the combined office of priest and prince and making it hereditary in the family of the Hasmonæans on the one hand, and by the complete emancipation of the Jewish people from Syrian supremacy on the other, completed on both its sides the work undertaken by Jonathan. The narrative is brought down to the death of Simon, so that altogether it embraces a period of forty years (175–135 B.C.). The *standpoint* of the author is that of orthodox, rigidly legal Judaism. But yet it is somewhat remarkable that the successes with which the Maccabæan enterprises were crowned are almost nowhere attributed to any immediate supernatural intervention on the part of God, but are represented throughout as the result of the military skill and political wisdom of the Maccabæan princes. Of course those princes always act with an unshaken trust in the powerful protection and help of God. It would therefore be a mistake to suppose that the author is not animated by a

ἔποίησε καὶ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ οὐ κατεγράφη, πολλὰ γὰρ ἦν σφόδρα. After οὐ κατεγράφη, we may suppose either “in this book” or “in the existing literature” to be understood. Probably the latter sense should be preferred, see Grimm, *Exeget. Handbuch zu 1 Makk.* p. 22 sq. The use of written sources in the First Book of Maccabees is also admitted for example by Nöldeke (*Die alttestamentliche Literatur*, p. 67) and Mendelssohn (*Acta societatis phil. Lips.*, ed. Ritschellius, vol. v. 1875, p. 99).

religious spirit. But still his way of putting things is at the same time rather different from that of the earlier historical works of the Old Testament. His *style* is the plain narrative style, being similar to that adopted in Old Testament historiography. The author has at his disposal such a fund of details that it is impossible to entertain any doubt as to the *credibility* of his narrative as a whole. His book is one of the most valuable sources we possess for the history of the Jewish people. Nor is its value in this respect in any way affected by the fact that the author shows himself to be very imperfectly informed with regard to the state of things among foreign nations. We see in this only the simple standpoint of the observer who, following his sources, confines his view exclusively to the circle of Jewish affairs. Again, the freedom with which numbers are dealt with and discourses put in the mouths of leading personages can scarcely be regarded as telling against the author. In matters of this sort ancient historians generally were never particularly scrupulous. It is a singularly fortunate circumstance that the dates of *all the more important events are duly fixed in accordance with a definite era, namely the Seleucidian era of the year 312 B.C.* (on the question as to whether in the present instance this era was made to date from the usual starting-point or from another somewhat different from it, see § 3). As regards the *date of composition*, it is admitted on all hands that this work must have been written previous to the Roman conquest, and therefore previous to the year 63 B.C. For as yet the Romans are known to the author merely as friends and protectors of the Jewish people in contrast to the Syrian kings. On the other hand, he is already acquainted with a chronicle referring to the history of John Hyrcanus, so that he must have written, at the soonest, toward the close of that prince's reign, probably not till after its close. According to this the work would be composed during the first decades of the first century before Christ. It was written *originally in Hebrew* (or Aramaic), as may be confidently

inferred from its grammatical peculiarities, and as is further confirmed by the testimony of Origen and Jerome. The Hebrew (or Aramaic) title *Σαρβήθ Σαβαναιέλ*, handed down by Origen, still continues to be as much as ever an unsolved enigma. The work has come down to us only in the form of a *Greek translation*, which was probably in existence as early as the time of Josephus. That it is still extant is due to the circumstance of its having been incorporated with the Greek Bible and, as forming part of this latter, read in the Christian Church.

At the close of his account of the Hebrew canon Origen adds (as quoted in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 25. 2) : "Εξω δὲ τούτων ἐστὶ τὰ Μακκαβαϊκά, ἅπερ ἐπιγέγραπται Σαρβήθ Σαβαναιέλ. Consequently he was acquainted with the First Book of Maccabees (for unquestionably it is it that is meant) in its Hebrew form, but as not belonging to the Hebrew canon. Jerome, *Prologus galeatus* to the Books of Samuel (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ix. 459 sq.) : Machabaeorum primum librum Hebraicum reperi. Secundus Graecus est, quod ex ipsa quoque φράσει probari potest. An endless variety of hypotheses have been advanced with the view of explaining the meaning of the title mentioned by Origen (see Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* iii. 745 ; Grimm, *Exeget. Handbuch* to 1 Macc. p. xvii. ; Keil, *Commentar über die Bücher der Makkabäer*, p. 22 ; Curtiss, *The Name Machabee*, 1876, p. 30 ; and the general literature mentioned below). But nearly all of them are based upon the reading *Σαρβήθ Σαρβανείλ* so generally adopted since Stephanus, whereas, according to the testimony of the manuscripts, the only reading that can claim to be recognised is *Σαρβήθ Σαβαναιέλ* (so also Josephus the Christian, *Hypomnest.* c. xxv. in Fabricius' *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* vol. ii. p. 48 of Appendix).

The acquaintance of Josephus with the *First Book of Maccabees* is generally regarded as beyond a doubt ; his acquaintance, on the other hand, with our Greek text has been questioned. In his German translation of 1 Maccabees (1778), Michaelis has propounded the view that Josephus made use of the Hebrew text. His arguments however are not of a cogent nature. The conjecture has recently been hazarded by Destinon (*Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*, 1882, pp. 60-91) that Josephus (or rather, as Destinon thinks, the anonymous writer whose work Josephus has merely remodelled) had an older redaction of 1 Maccabees before him which, on the one hand, was, in regard to many points, rather fuller than our book, while, on the other, it wanted as yet the whole of the last section, chaps. xiv.-xvi., which is to be regarded as a subsequent addition. But the first point cannot be sufficiently substantiated ; for the extra matters found in Josephus were either drawn from other sources or had their origin in the historian's own imagination. As for the other question again, whether Josephus was acquainted with the concluding section of the book, it is one that

of course deserves consideration in view of the singular brevity with which the historian disposes of the reign of Simon. As favouring the view that Josephus was acquainted with our Greek text, see Grimm, *Exeget. Handbuch* to 1 Macc. p. xxviii. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Flavii Josephus*, 1879, pp. 80–90.

In the *Christian Church* our book has been read from the very first. See Tertullian, *Adv. Judaeos*, c. iv.: Nam et temporibus Maccabaeorum sabbatis pugnando fortiter fecerunt, etc. (comp. 1 Macc. ii. 41 sqq.). Hippolytus, in narrating the history of the Maccabean rising in his *Comment. in Daniel*, c. xxxi.–xxxii. (*Opp.* ed. Lagarde, p. 163), adheres closely to our book, quoting 1 Macc. ii. 33 sqq. almost word for word. Origen (besides the passage in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 25. 2, already mentioned), particularly *Comment. in epist. ad Rom.* book viii. chap. i. (in Lommatzsch, vii. 193): Sicut Mathathias, de quo in primo libro Machabaeorum scriptum est quia “zelatus est in lege Dei,” etc. (1 Macc. ii. 24). Observe the designation of our book as the *First Book of Maccabees*, precisely as in the case of Jerome in the passage already quoted and in that of Eusebius, *Demonstr. evang.* viii. 2. 72, ed. Gaisford. Cyprian quotes several passages from the book in his *Testimonia*, and always with the formula, in *Machabaeis* (*Testimon.* iii. 4, 15, 53). For the further history of the book in the Christian Church, see the various works and dissertations on the history of the Old Testament canon, also Jahn’s *Einleitung in die göttl. Bücher des Alten Bundes*, 2nd ed. Part ii. § 3 and 4 (1803), 1st and 2nd supplements, and likewise my article “Apokryphen des A. T.,” in Herzog’s *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. i. 485–489. As is well known, it has been the practice in the Protestant Church to follow Jerome in applying the designation “Apocrypha” to such books as are not included in the Hebrew canon, and it so happens that our book is one of them.

From the history of the book just given, it will be seen that the Greek text has been transmitted to us only through the manuscripts of the Greek Bible. The Books of Maccabees being omitted in Codex *Vaticanus*, 1209, the most important *manuscripts* here are the Codex *Sinaiticus* (quoted in Fritzsche’s edition of the Apocrypha as x.), and the Codex *Alexandrinus* (known in Fritzsche, as in Holmes and Parsons before him, as No. iii.); next to these comes a Codex *Venetus* (known in the critical apparatuses as No. 23). All the other manuscripts are minusculi. For more precise information on this point, see my article “Apocrypha,” in Herzog’s *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. i. pp. 489–491. The text of our book, in common with that of the so-called Apocrypha generally, is to be found in the majority of the editions of the *Septuagint*. The received text is borrowed from the Sixtine edition (*Vetus Testamentum juxta Septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti v. Pont. Max. editum*, Romae 1587). The most copious critical apparatus we have is to be found in the *Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, edd. Holmes et Parsons, 5 vols. Oxonii, 1798–1827 (the whole of the Apocrypha are given together in the fifth volume). We have a handy portable edition in the shape of the *Vetus Testamentum Graece juxta LXX. interpretes*, ed. Tischendorf, 2 vols. Leipz. 1850 (6th ed. 1880). Tischendorf as well as Holmes and Parsons follow the Sixtine text. Among the *separate editions of the Apocrypha* we may mention the *Libri Vet. Test. Apocryphi, textum graecum recognovit*, Augusti, Lips. 1804, and the *Libri Vet. Test. apocryphi graece, accurate*

recognitos, ed. Apel, Lips. 1837. The latest and best of such editions, although even it fails as yet to satisfy every requirement, is the *Libri apocryphi Veteris Testamenti graece, recensuit et cum commentario critico*, edidit Fritzsche, Lips. 1871 (Fritzsche gives a recension of his own based upon the materials furnished by Holmes and Parsons, and upon the recently acquired Codex Sinaiticus as well as the fragments in the Codex Ephraemi). So far as some of the books are concerned, Fritzsche had not as yet collated them with the most important of the manuscripts, the Codex Vaticanus, there being no complete collation in Holmes and Parsons. It is true no doubt that this manuscript had been already made use of for the Sixtine edition, so that so far it helped to shape the received text. But the text of the Vaticanus could not be said to be known to any trustworthy extent till the issue of the new Roman edition (*Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecus Codex Vaticanus*, edd. Vercellone et Cozza, 6 vols. Rome 1868–1881; comp. *Theol. Litztg.* 1882, p. 121). The edition of Mai (*Vetus et Novum Testamentum ex antiquissimo codice Vaticano*, 5 vols. Rome 1857) is unreliable. Nestle has added to the latest edition of Tischendorf's Septuagint, a collation based upon the edition of Vercellone and Cozza (also published separately under the title, *Veteris Testamenti codices Vaticanus et Sinaiticus cum textu recepto collati ab E. Nestle*, Lips. 1880).³ For more on the editions, see Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vol. i. 494 sq.

Of the early translations the following are of interest in connection with the history of the transmission of the text: (1) The Latin of which there are two, (a) the one that was incorporated with the Vulgate, and (b) another which, as far as chap. xiii., has been preserved in a *Codex Sangermanensis*, both being given in Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. ii. Remis 1743. (2) The Syriac in the Peshito (separate edition; *Libri Vet. Test. apocryphi Syriace*, ed. Lagarde, Lips. 1861). In the great Peshito manuscript of Milan reproduced in photo-lithograph by Ceriani (*Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex codice Ambrosiano*, ed. Ceriani, 2 vols. Milan 1876–1883), we have, as far as chap. xiv., a Syriac translation which deviates from the printed received text; see Ceriani's prolegomena; and Nestle, *Theol. Literaturztg.* 1884, col. 28. For more on the early translations, see Herzog's *Real-Enc.* i. 491–494. Also the texts in the London *Polyglot*, vol. iv.

Exegetical Aids. (1) *Special lexicon*: Wahl, *Clavis librorum Veteris Testamenti apocryphorum philologica*, Lips. 1853. (2) *Modern versions.* The German translations of De Wette (*Die heil. Schrift des A. und N. T.'s übersetzt*, 4th ed. 1858) and of Holtzmann (in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde*, vol. vii. Leipzig 1869), the latter with short notes. Versions in other modern languages: Dijserinck, *De apocriefe boeken des ouden verbonds*,

³ The above observations on the Codex Vaticanus are made merely with the view of indicating on what side Fritzsche's edition of the Apocrypha generally stands in need of revision and greater completeness. The *First Book of Maccabees* is precisely that portion of the Apocrypha to which those observations do not apply for the simple reason that it is not found in that codex.

uit het grieksch opnieuw vertaald en met opschriften en eenige aanteekeningen voorzien, Haarlem 1874. Reuss, *La Bible, traduction nouvelle avec introductions et commentaires, Ancien Testament*, VI^e partie, *Philosophie religieuse et morale des Hebreux*, Paris 1879 (containing among others Sirach, Wisdom, Tobit, the appendices to Daniel, Baruch, the Prayer of Manasseh); VII^e partie of the same work, *Literature politique et polemique*, Paris 1879 (containing among others, the Books of Maccabees, Judith, Bel and the Dragon, Epistle of Jeremiah). Bissell, *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament with historical introductions, a revised translation, and notes critical and explanatory*, New York 1880. On Luther's translation, see Grimm, *Luthers Uebersetzung der A.T. Apokr.* (Stud. u. Krit. 1883, pp. 375–400). (3) *Commentaries*: J. D. Michaelis, *Deutsche Uebersetzung des ersten Buchs der Maccabäer mit Anmerkungen*, 1778. Grimm, *Das erste Buch der Maccabäer erklärt* (*Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des A. T.'s*, 3 parts), Leipzig 1853 (by far the most sterling work on the subject which we possess). Keil, *Commentar über die Bücher der Maccabäer*, Leipzig 1875. For additional exegetical literature, see Grimm, p. xxxiv. sq. Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii. 317 sq., and Herzog's *Real-Enc.* vol. i. 496.

Works of critical inquiry: Frölich, *Annales compendiarii regum et rerum Syriae*, Viennae 1744. E. F. Wernsdorf, *De fontibus historiae Syriae in libris Maccabaeorum prolusio*, Lips. 1746. Frölich, *De fontibus historiae Syriae in libris Maccabaeorum prolusio Lipsiae edita in examen vocata*, Viennae 1746. Gottl. Wernsdorf, *Commentatio historico-critica de fide historica librorum Maccabaicorum*, Wratislav. 1747. (Khell), *Auctoritas utriusque libri Maccabaici canonico-historica adserta*, Viennae 1749. Rosenthal, *Das erste Maccabäerbuch*, Leipzig 1867. Schnedermann, *Ueber das Judenthum der beiden ersten Maccabäerbücher* (*Zeitschr. für kirchl. Wissensch. und kirchl. Leben*, 1884, pp. 78–100). Critical material is also to be found in the early and the more recent polemical treatises on the value of the Apocrypha by Rainold, Keerl, Stier, Hengstenberg, Vincenzi, and others; see Herzog's *Real-Enc.* i. p. 489.

For the *circumstances under which our book and the Apocrypha generally were written*, see Jahn, *Einleitung in die göttl. Bücher des A. B.*, 2nd ed., second part, 3rd and 4th secs., Wien 1803. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in die apokryphischen Schriften des A. T.*, Leipzig 1795. Bertholdt, *Historisch-kritische Einl. in die sämtl. kanon. und apokr. Schriften des A. und N. T.'s*, 6 vols., Erlangen 1812–1819. Welte, *Specielle Einleitung in die deuterokanonischen Bücher des A. T.'s*, Freiburg 1844 (also under the title, *Einl. in die heil. Schriften des A. T.'s von Herbst*, 2 parts, 3 divisions). Scholz, *Einleitung in die heil. Schriften des A. und N. T.'s*, 3 vols., Köln 1845–1848. Nöldeke, *Die Alttestamentliche Literatur in einer Reihe von Aufsätzen dargestellt*, Leipzig 1868. De Wette, *Lehrbuch der hist.-krit. Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Bücher des A. T.'s*, 8th ed., bearb. von Schrader, Berlin 1869. Reusch, *Lehrb. der Einl. in das A. T.*, 4th ed., Freiburg 1870. Keil, *Lehrb. der hist.-krit. Einleitung in die kanon. und apokryph. Schriften des A. T.'s*, 3rd ed., 1873. Kaulen, *Einleitung in die heil. Schrift A. und N. T.'s*, 2 divisions, 1st part, *Besondere Einl. in das A. T.*, Freiburg 1881. Kleinert, *Abriss der Einleitung zum A. T. in Taber-*

lenform, Berlin 1878. Reuss, *Geschichte der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments*, Braunschweig 1881. Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, 1857, p. 200 sqq. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 602 sqq. Fritzsche in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* iv. 89 sqq.

2. *The History of John Hyrcanus.*

We have probably a work similar to that of the First Book of Maccabees in the *History of John Hyrcanus*, to which reference is made at the close of the former, where it is said, 1 Macc. xvi. 23, 24: καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰωάννου καὶ τῶν πολέμων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀνδραγαθιῶν αὐτοῦ ὧν ἡνδραγάθησε, καὶ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῶν τειχέων ὧν ᾠκοδόμησε, καὶ τῶν πράξεων αὐτοῦ, ἰδοὺ ταῦτα γέγραπται ἐπὶ βιβλίων ἡμερῶν ἀρχιερωσύνης αὐτοῦ, ἀφ' οὗ ἐγενήθη ἀρχιερεὺς μετὰ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ. Apart from this notice we have no further information regarding this work. As the reign of John Hyrcanus did not possess the same interest for subsequent generations as the epoch in which Jewish independence was established through the achievements of the Maccabees, the book would have but a limited circulation, and could not fail soon to be lost altogether. It is evident that Josephus knew nothing of it in his time, for the supposition that he made use of it in his *Antiquities*⁴ is more than improbable. What few notices he has regarding the reign of John Hyrcanus at all are either borrowed, in so far as they refer to external political history, from Greek historians, or, in so far as they refer to internal affairs, are of a purely legendary character. No trace can be detected of the use of any contemporary Jewish source. Considering then at how early a period the history of Hyrcanus dropped out of sight, it is inconceivable that it should still have existed in manuscript in the sixteenth century as, following Sixtus Senensis, many have assumed.

In his *Bibliotheca sancta* (Venetiis 1566) Sixtus Senensis gives an account at p. 61 sq. of a *Fourth Book of Maccabees* which he saw in the library of Santes Pagninus at Lyons, and which began as follows: Καὶ

⁴ So Bloch, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus* (1879), pp. 90-94.

μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτανθῆναι τὸν Σίμωνα ἐγενήθη Ἰωάννης υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς αὐτοῦ. Judging from the enumeration of the contents as given by Sixtus, this book simply narrates the history of John Hyrcanus, and that precisely as in Josephus (the same facts and in the same order). With regard to this he himself observes: *Historiae series et narratio eadem fere est quae apud Josephum libro Antiquitatum decimo tertio; sed stylus, hebraicis idiotismis abundans, longe dispar.* Consequently he ventures to conjecture that it may have been a Greek translation of the history of Hyrcanus mentioned at the end of the First Book of Maccabees. Many modern writers have concurred in this conjecture, and hence their regret that the manuscript should have perished soon after, when the library just mentioned was destroyed by fire (see Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graeca*, iii. 748. Grimm, *Exeget. Handbuch*, note on 1 Macc. xvi. 24). But, in view of the enumeration of the contents given by Sixtus, it seems to me there can hardly be a doubt that the book was simply a reproduction of Josephus, the style being changed perhaps for a purpose.

3. *Josephus' History of the Jewish War.*

In post-Hasmonaeon times the fondness for writing histories seems to have died away. At least we nowhere come across any hint to the effect that the writing of anything like connected historical narratives had been undertaken by any one.⁵ It was not till the important events of the war, extending from the year 66 to 70 B.C., that the occasion for such histories once more presented itself. The Jewish priest Joseph, son of Matthias, better known under the name of Flavius Josephus, wrote the history of this war, of which he himself had personal knowledge, whether as a passive observer or as playing an active part in it. He composed the work in his own vernacular, therefore in the *Aramaic tongue*, and intended it chiefly for the benefit of the *ἄνω βάρβαροι*, i.e. the Jews of Mesopotamia and Babylon. Of this work we know nothing beyond what he himself mentions in his Greek

⁵ We know of but two classes of historical documents of any kind belonging to that period: (1) *Family registers*, the preservation and continuation of which were matters of consequence for religious reasons (on these registers see vol. i. pp. 210 and 212). (2) The *Calendar of Fasts*, *Megillath Taanith*, i.e. a list of the days on which, owing to some happy event being commemorated, there was to be no fasting (for details, see § 3). But neither class of writings, although historical documents, can be said to belong to the category of historical literature.

version of the history of the Jewish war, *Bell. Jud. prooem.* 1, where he says: *προυθέμην ἐγὼ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν, Ἑλλάδι γλώσση μεταβαλὼν, ἃ τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις τῇ πατρίῳ συντάξας ἀνέπεμψα πρότερον, ἀφηγήσασθαι.* The Greek version of this work, in common with the extant works of Josephus generally, belongs to the department of Hellenistico-Jewish literature, and will therefore fall to be mentioned in the next section.

II. THE PSALMODIC LITERATURE.

1. *The Psalms of the Maccabæan Age.*

It had been already observed by Calvin with reference to the 44th Psalm that: *Querimoniae quas continet, proprie conveniunt in miserum illud et calamitosum tempus, quo grassata est saevissima tyrannis Antiochi.* Ever since, the question, whether psalms belonging to the Maccabæan age are also to be found in our canon, has been mooted and more and more answered in the affirmative. It was Hitzig, Lengerke, and Olshausen above all, that referred a large number of the psalms to the time of the Maccabæan struggles and to a still later period (embracing the reign of the Hasmonæan princes down to the second century B.C.). Others have limited the number of Maccabæan psalms to only a very few. But the fact that we have psalms belonging to Maccabæan times in the canon at all is being more and more recognised. Nor is it possible to allege any plausible reason for thinking otherwise. For the assertion, that that was an age but little calculated to develope religious fervour or poetical genius is a mere *petitio principii*, while as little can be said in favour of the other assertion, that at that time the canon had been already closed. For this is just a point about which we simply know nothing whatever unless we ought rather to say that the Book of Daniel alone is sufficient proof to the contrary. If therefore

the possibility of the existence of psalms belonging to Maccabaeen times be beyond question, then it can only be shown from the contents of the different psalms themselves how far that possibility is also a reality. Accordingly there is a wide consensus of opinion in favour of the view that the 44th, 77th, 79th, and 83rd Psalms above all contain within themselves the most powerful reasons possible for ascribing their origin to the Maccabaeen age. It was only then that it could be rightly and fairly asserted, as is done in Ps. xlv., that the people had faithfully adhered to the covenant made with Jehovah and had not deviated from it, and that it was just for this very reason, therefore for their religion, that they were being persecuted (Ps. xlv. 18, 19, 23). It is only to such a time as that that we could well refer the complaints that the "houses of God" (מִזְבְּחֵי-אֵל), *i.e.* the synagogues, had been burnt in the land, and that there is no longer any prophet there (Ps. lxxiv. 8, 9). There is no age except the Maccabaeen to which all that could so well apply which, in Ps. lxxix., is said about the desecration, but not the destruction of the temple, and the laying waste of Jerusalem, and in Ps. lxxxiii. on the persecution of Israel. But, if these four psalms had their origin in Maccabaeen times, then there are many more of a kindred nature that must be referred to the same period. The real point at issue then can only be not "whether" there are any such psalms at all, but only "how many of them" there are. And this will always remain a disputed point, for there are but few of the psalms that bear such evident traces of the date and circumstances of their origin as those just mentioned. Meanwhile let it suffice to have pointed out the fact that the holy Church of the Maccabaeen time has given proof of its creative powers in the department of sacred lyrics as well, through those new psalms in which it pours out its wail of distress before God and cries for protection and help from the Almighty.

For the *literature* of this question, see the various introductions to the Old Testament, for example De Wette-Schrader, *Einleit. in die kanon. und*

apokr. Bücher des A. T.'s (1869), § 334; Kleinert, *Abriss der Einl. zum A. T.* (1878) p. 45.

The following authorities have expressed themselves in favour of the view that there are Maccabaeian psalms in our canon: Rüdinger (1580). Venema (1762-67). E. G. Bengel, *Dissertatio ad introductiones in librum Psalmorum supplementa quaedam exhibens*, Tübing. 1806. Hitzig, *Begriff der Kritik, am A. T. praktisch erörtert*, Heidelb. 1831. Idem, *Die Psalmen*, 2 vols. Heidelb. 1835, 1836. Idem, *Ueber die Zeitdauer der hebräischen Psalmenpoesie* (*Züricher Monatschr.* 1856, pp. 436-452). Hesse, *De psalmis Maccabaicis*, Vratisl. 1837. Lengerke, *Die fünf Bücher der Psalmen*, 2 vols. Königsberg 1847. Olshausen, *Die Psalmen erklärt*, Leipzig 1853 (being the fourteenth number of the Exegetical Handbook to the Old Testament). De Jong, *Disquisitio de Psalmis Maccabaicis*, Lugd. Bat. 1857. Steiner, art. "Psalmen," in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* vol. v. pp. 1-9. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), § 481. Comp. further, Reuss, *La Bible Ancien Testament*, 5th part, Paris 1875. Giesebrecht, *Ueber die Abfassungszeit der Psalmen* (*Stade's Zeitsch. für die alttestamentl. Wissensch.* vol. i. 1881, pp. 276-332). Delitzsch in the more recent editions of his commentary on the psalms also admits the existence of several Maccabaeian psalms.

The following authorities again take an opposite view: Gesenius in No. 81 of the supplements to the *Allgemeinen Literaturzeitung*, 1816. Hassler, *Comment. crit. de psalmis Maccab.* 2 vols. Ulm 1827-1832. Ewald, *Jahrb. der bibl. Wissensch.* vi. 1854, pp. 20-32, viii. 1857, p. 165 sqq. Dillmann, *Jahrbh. für deutsche Theol.* 1858, p. 460 sqq. Hupfeld, *Die Psalmen, übersetzt und ausgelegt*, 4 vols. Gotha 1855-1862. Ehrt, *Abfassungszeit und Abschluss des Psalters zur Prüfung der Frage nach Makkabäerpsalmen historisch-kritisch untersucht*, Leipzig 1869. Wanner, *Etude critique sur les Psaumes*, 44, 74, 79 et 83 considérés par plusieurs théologiens comme provenant de l'époque des Maccabées, Lusanne 1876 (comp. the reviews in the *Revue de théologie et de philosophie*, 1877, p. 399 sq.).

2. The Psalms of Solomon.

In the list of books as given in several copies of the Christian canon of the Old Testament the *ψαλμοὶ Σολομῶντος* are also included, and that, in some instances, under the category of *ἀντιλεγόμενα* along with the Books of Maccabees, the Wisdom of Solomon, Jesus the Son of Sirach, Judith, Tobit, etc. (as in the case of the so-called Stichometria of Nicephorus and in the *Synopsis Athanasii*), and in others under the category of *ἀπόκρυφα* along with Enoch, the Patriarchs, Apocalypses of Moses and Ezra, etc. (as in the case of an anonymous list of the canon still extant in various manu-

scripts). From its first-mentioned position we can see that, in the Christian Church, this book was in many quarters regarded as canonical. It is included under the category of *ἀντιλεγόμενα*, simply because, not being in the Hebrew canon, it was not acknowledged to be canonical by those who made that the standard. Besides this there are still in existence several Greek manuscripts of the Bible in which the *Psalms of Solomon* find a place precisely in accordance with the lists just mentioned; and it is just possible that, if the manuscripts of the Septuagint were carefully searched, there might be found to be still more of them than are already known to us. These psalms amount to *eighteen* in number. They were first printed from an Augsburg manuscript by de la Cerda (1626), and subsequently by Fabricius (1713), while, in our own time, an edition, collated with a Vienna manuscript, has been published by Hilgenfeld, whose text is also followed in the editions of Geiger, Fritzsche, and Pick.

The ascribing of these psalms to Solomon is simply due to the later transcribers. The work itself does not lay the slightest claim to such authorship; on the contrary, it betrays very distinct traces of the date of its composition. That certainly was not, as Ewald, Grimm, Oehler, Dillmann (at one time), Weiffenbach, and Anger would have us believe, the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, nor, as Movers, Delitzsch, and Keim suppose, the time of Herod, but, as is now universally admitted, — for example, by Langen, Hilgenfeld, Nöldeke, Geiger, Carriere, Wellhausen, Reuss, Dillmann (now), — the period shortly after the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey. That the psalms were composed at that time may be regarded as absolutely certain from the various explicit indications of this in the *second*, *eighth*, and *seventeenth* psalms. The contemporary state of things which these psalms presuppose is somewhat as follows: A family to which the promise of ruling over Israel had not been given seized the reins of government by force (xvii. 6). They did not give God the glory, but of themselves assumed the king's crown, and took

possession of the throne of David (xvii. 7, 8). In their time the whole of Israel fell into sin. The king despised the law, the judge was unfaithful to truth, and the people lived in sin (xvii. 21, 22). But God overthrew those princes by raising up against them a man from a strange land, and who was not of the race of Israel (xvii. 8, 9). From the ends of the earth God brought one who could strike with a mighty blow, who declared war against Jerusalem and all its territory. The princes of the land in their blindness went out to meet him with joy, and said to him: "Thy approach has been longed for, come hither, enter in peace." They opened the gates to him, so that he entered like a father into the house of his sons (viii. 15-20). But after he had securely established himself in the city he also seized the battlements, and threw down the walls of Jerusalem with the battering-ram (viii. 21, ii. 1). Jerusalem was trodden under foot by the heathen (ii. 20); nay the strange peoples ascended the altar of God itself (ii. 2). All the leading men and every wise man in the council were put to death; and the blood of the inhabitants of Jerusalem was poured out like unclean water (viii. 23). The inhabitants of the land were carried away captive into the *West*, and its princes insulted (xvii. 13, 14, ii. 6, viii. 24). But at last the dragon that had conquered Jerusalem (ii. 29) was itself put to death on the mountains of Egypt by the sea-shore. But his body was allowed to lie unburied (ii. 30, 31). It can scarcely require any further commentary to prove that we are here dealing with the time of the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey, and that it is to it alone that the circumstances presupposed can be said to apply. The princes who had been so arrogant as to assume the rule over Jerusalem and take possession of the throne of David, are the *Hasmonaeans*, who, ever since Aristobulus I., had taken the title of king. The last of the princes of this house, Alexander Jannaeus and Aristobulus II., openly favoured the Sadducean party, so that in the eyes of our author, with his Pharisaic leanings, they appeared in the light

of sinful and lawless men. The "man of the strange land," and "of powerful blows," whom God summons from the end of the earth, is no other than *Pompey*. The princes who go out to meet him are Aristobulus II. and Hyrcanus II. The supporters of this latter opened the gates of the city to Pompey, who then proceeded to take by storm (ἐν κριῶ, ii. 1) the other portion of the town in which those belonging to Aristobulus's party had entrenched themselves. All the rest that follows, the contemptuous treading of the temple by the conquerors, the mowing down of the inhabitants, the execution of the leading men among them,⁶ the carrying away of the captives to the West, and of the princes to be mocked (εἰς ἐμπαιγμόν, xvii. 14, i.e. for the triumphal procession in Rome), corresponds with what actually took place. But it is above all the circumstance of the captives being carried away to the West (xvii. 14) that proves that the taking of Jerusalem by Pompey is alone to be thought of. For the only other case besides this that might possibly be in view is the conquest of Jerusalem by Titus, but to this none of the other circumstances are found to apply.⁷ But if there could be any doubt before, it utterly vanishes when finally we are told that the conqueror was killed on the coast of Egypt, on the sea-shore (ἐπὶ κυμάτων), and that his body was left lying without being buried (ii. 31). For this is precisely what actually took place in the case of Pompey (in the year 48 B.C.). Consequently the second psalm was undoubtedly composed soon after this event, while the eighth and seventeenth, as well as most of the others, may be assumed to have been written between the years 63-48. There exists no reason whatever for coming down so late as to the time of Herod. For "the man from the strange land," who, according to xvii. 9, rose up against the Hasmonaeans

⁶ Ps. viii. 28 : ἀπώλεσεν ἄρχοντας αὐτῶν καὶ πάντα σοφὸν ἐν βουλῇ, compare with Joseph. Antt. xiv. 4. 4 (Bell. Jud. i. 7. 6) : τοὺς αἰτίους τοῦ πολέμου τῷ πελέκει διεχρήσατο.

⁷ There is above all the circumstance that nowhere in our psalms is there any mention whatever of a destruction of the city and the temple.

princes, is, as the context makes it impossible to doubt, the same personage who, according to xvii. 14, carries away the captives to the West, and therefore not Herod, as Movers, Delitzsch, and Keim would have us suppose, but Pompey.

The spirit which the psalms breathe is entirely that of Pharisaic Judaism. They are pervaded by an earnest moral tone and a sincere piety. But the righteousness which they preach and the dearth of which they deplore is, all through, the righteousness that consists in complying with all the Pharisaic prescriptions, the *δικαιοσύνη προσταγμάτων* (xiv. 1). The fate of man after death is represented as depending simply upon his works. It is left entirely in his own option whether he is to decide in favour of righteousness or unrighteousness (comp. especially ix. 7). If he does the former he will rise again to eternal life (iii. 16); if the latter, eternal perdition will be his doom (xiii. 9 sqq., xiv. 2 sqq., xv.) As a contrast to the unlawful rule of the Hasmonaeans, which had been put an end to by Pompey, the author cherishes the confident expectation of that Messianic king of the house of David who is one day to lead Israel to the promised glory (xvii. 1, 5, 23–51, xviii. 6–10. Comp. further vii. 9, xi.).

The view previously held by Grätz, that our psalms are of Christian origin, seems to have been abandoned by that writer himself,⁸ and, in any case, does not call for serious refutation. But neither have we any right to assume that they contain even Christian interpolations. For the sinlessness and holiness which the author ascribes to the Messiah expected by him (xvii. 41, 46), is not sinlessness in the sense of Christian dogmatics, but simply rigid legalism in the Pharisaic sense.

Despite Hilgenfeld's view to the contrary, it is almost universally allowed that the psalms were originally composed in Hebrew. And undoubtedly not without good reason. For the diction of the psalms is so decidedly Hebrew in its character that it is impossible to suppose that they were

⁸ The remark here referred to (*Gesch. der Juden*, vol. iii. 2nd ed. p. 439) is not repeated in the 3rd ed. vol. iii. p. 621.

written originally in Greek. And for this reason it is no less certain that they were not written in Alexandria, but in Palestine. It may not be amiss to mention further the correspondence, to some extent a verbal one, between *Psalms* xi. and the fifth chapter of *Baruch*. If we are correct in supposing that the psalms were written originally in Hebrew, then the imitation must be regarded as being on the part of *Baruch*.

The place assigned to our psalms in the Christian canon: I. Among the ἀντιλεγόμενα: (1) in the Stichometria of Nicephorus as given in Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons* (1847), p. 120, *Nicephori opuscula*, ed. de Boor (Lips. 1880), p. 134. (2) In the *Synopsis Athanasii*, as given in Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 144. II. Among the ἀπόκρυφα in an anonymous list of canonical books which has been printed (1) from a certain Codex Coislinianus as given in Montfaucon's *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, Paris 1715, p. 194; (2) from a Parisian manuscript as given in Cotelier's *Patrum apost. Opp.* vol. i. 1698, p. 196; (3) from a certain Codex Baroccianus at Oxford, and as given in Hody's *De Bibliorum textibus*, 1705, p. 649, col. 44; (4) from a Vatican codex as given in Pitra's *Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta*, vol. i. 1864, p. 100 (on the relation of those four texts to each other, see No. V. below, the chapter on the lost Apocalypses). III. In his scholia to the decrees of the Council of Laodicea, Zonaras observes in connection with the 59th canon (Beveregius, *Pandectae canonum*, Oxon. 1672, vol. i. p. 481): ἐκτὸς τῶν ῥ' ψαλμῶν τοῦ Δαβὶδ εὐρίσκονται καὶ τινες ἕτεροι λεγόμενοι τοῦ Σολομῶντος εἶναι καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν, οὓς καὶ ἰδιωτικοὺς ὠνόμασαν οἱ πατέρες καὶ μὴ λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ διετάξαντο. Similarly Balsamon (in Beveregius, i. 480). IV. In the Codex Alexandrinus of the Greek Bible the Psalms of Solomon, as is shown by the list of contents prefixed to the codex, found a place in the Appendix to the New Testament after the Epistles of Clement (see Credner, *Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons*, 1860, p. 238 sq.). In the Vienna manuscript, on the other hand, where the Psalms are still extant, they come in between the Wisdom of Solomon and Jesus the Son of Sirach.

Up to the present time the *manuscripts* that have been found are five in number: (1) The manuscript from which the *editio princeps* of de la Cerdá was printed; it was brought from Constantinople in the year 1615, was in the possession of David Höschel, and then found its way to the Augsburg library (Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* i. 973, 914 sq.), but it has now disappeared. (2) A Vienna codex (*cod. gr. theol.* 7), Haupt's collation of which Hilgenfeld made use of in his edition of the Psalms. (3) A Copenhagen manuscript, an account of which is given by Graux in the *Revue Critique*, 1877, No. 46, pp. 291–293. (4) A Moscow manuscript and (5) a Parisian one, both of which were discovered and collated by Gebhardt (see *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1877, p. 627 sq.). The three last-mentioned MSS. have not yet been made use of in any edition of our Psalms.

Editions: (1) De la Cerda, *Adversaria sacra*, Lyons 1626, Appendix. (2) Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti*, vol. i. 1713, pp. 914-999. (3) Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, 1868, pp. 134-168. Idem, *Messias Judaeorum*, Lips. 1869, pp. 1-33. (4) Eduard Ephräm Geiger, *Der Psalter Salomo's herausgegeben und erklärt*, Augsburg 1871. (5) Fritzsche, *Libri apocryphi Veteris Testamenti graece*, Lips. 1871, pp. 569-589. (6) Pick, *Presbyterian Review*, 1883, Oct. pp. 775-812. A new edition was prepared by Gebhardt for the "*Texte und Untersuchungen*," edited by himself and Harnack.

German translations with explanatory notes have been published by Geiger as above. Hilgenfeld, *Die Psalmen Salomo's deutsch übersetzt und aufs Neue untersucht* (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, 1871, pp. 383-418). Wellhausen, *Die Phariseer und die Sadducäer* (1874), pp. 131-164. There is an English translation by Pick as above.

On the circumstances under which our Psalms were written: I. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iv. 392 sq. (subsequently Ewald hit upon the idea of dating the Psalms back to the time of Ptolemy Lagus; see the reviews of the writing of Geiger and Carriere in the *Göttinger gel. Anzeigen*, 1871, pp. 841-850, and 1873, pp. 237-240). Grimm, *Exeget. Handbuch zu 1 Makk.* p. 27. Oehler, art. "Messias," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. ix. 426 sq. Dillmann, art. "Pseudepigraphen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. xii. 305 sq. Weiffenbach, *Quae Jesu in regno coelesti dignitas sit synopticorum sententia exponitur* (Gissae, 1868), p. 49 sq. Anger, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der messianischen Idee* (1873), p. 81 sq. II. Movers in Wetzer und Welte's *Kirchenlex.* 1st ed. i. 340. Delitzsch, *Commentar über den Psalter*, 1st ed. ii. 381 sq. Keim, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, i. 243. III. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina* (1866), pp. 64-70. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr.* 1868, *Messias Judaeorum proleg.*, *Zeitschr.* 1871. Nöldeke, *Die alttestamentl. Literatur* (1868), p. 141 sq. Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. i. pp. 157 sq., 168. Geiger in his edition of our Psalms. Fritzsche, *prolegom.* to his edition. Wittichen, *Die Idee des Reiches Gottes* (1872), pp. 155-160. Carriere, *De psalterio Salomonis*, Argentorati 1870. Wellhausen, *Die Phariseer und die Sadducäer*, p. 112 sqq. Stähelin, *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1874, p. 203. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah* (1877), pp. 133-142. Kaulen in Wetzer und Welte's *Kirchenlex.* 2nd ed. i. 1060 sq. Lucius, *Der Essenismus* (1881), pp. 119-121. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.'s*, § 526. Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vol. xii. 1883, p. 346. Pick, *The Psalter of Solomon* (*Presbyterian Review*, 1883 Oct. pp. 775-812).

III. THE GNOMIC WISDOM.

1. *Jesus the Son of Sirach.*

There is nothing that shows so clearly the practical character of the Palestinian Jewish literature of our period, as the fact

that even in the *merely theoretical speculations* of the time there was always an eye to the practical aims and tasks of life. A theoretical philosophy strictly so called was a thing entirely foreign to genuine Judaism. Whatever it did happen to produce in the way of "*philosophy*" (= *wisdom*, חֵכְמָה) either had practical religious problems as its theme (Job, Ecclesiastes), or was of a directly practical nature, being: *directions based upon a thoughtful study of human things for so regulating our life as to ensure our being truly happy*. The form in which those contemplations and instructions were presented was that of the מִשְׁלֵּל, the *apothegm*, which contained a single thought expressed in concise and comprehensive terms, and in a form more or less poetical, and in which there was nothing of the nature of discussion or argument. A collection of aphorisms of this sort had already found a place among the canonical writings of the Old Testament in the shape of the so-called proverbs of Solomon. We have a collection of a similar character in the book known as *Jesus the Son of Sirach*, and which we now proceed to consider. This book takes that older collection as its model, not only as regards the form, but the matter as well, though it contributes a large number of new and original thoughts. The fundamental thought of the author is that of *wisdom*. For him the highest and most perfect wisdom resides only in God, who has established and who continues to govern all things in accordance with His marvellous knowledge and understanding. On the part of man, therefore, true wisdom consists in his trusting and obeying God. The fear of God is the beginning and end of all wisdom. Hence it is that the author, living as he did at a time when the fear of God and the observance of the law were already regarded as one and the same thing, inculcates above all the duty of adhering faithfully to the law and keeping the commandments. But besides this he also points out in the next place how the truly wise man is to comport himself in the manifold relationships of practical life. And accordingly his book contains an inexhaustible fund of rules

for the regulation of one's conduct in joy and sorrow, in prosperity and adversity, in sickness and in health, in struggle and temptation, in social life, in intercourse with friends and enemies, with high and low, rich and poor, with the good and the wicked, the wise and the foolish, in trade, business and one's ordinary calling, above all, in one's own house and family in connection with the training of children, the treatment of men-servants and maid-servants, and the way in which a man ought to behave toward his own wife and the fair sex generally. For all those manifold relationships the most precise directions are furnished, directions that are prompted by a spirit of moral earnestness which only now and then degenerates into mere worldly prudence. The counsels of the author are the mature fruit of a profound and comprehensive study of human things and of a wide experience of life. In entering as they do into such a multiplicity of details, they at the same time furnish us with a lively picture of the manners and customs and of the culture generally of his time and his people. How far the thoughts expressed, as well as the form in which they are expressed, were the author's own, and how far he only collected what was already in current and popular use it is of course impossible in any particular instance to determine. To a certain extent he may have done both. But in any case he was not a mere collector or compiler, the characteristic personality of the author stands out far too distinctly and prominently for that. Notwithstanding the diversified character of the apothegms, they are all the outcome of one connected view of life and the world.

At the close of the book, chap. L. 27, the author calls himself *Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Σιράχ ὁ Ἱεροσολυμίτης*. Many manuscripts insert *Ἐλεάζαρ* after *Σιράχ*; but this, despite the strong testimony in its favour, must be regarded as a gloss (see Fritzsche's edition and commentary). The name *Σιράχ* is equivalent to the Hebrew *סִרְיָה*, "a coat of mail" (the accent being on the final syllable as in *ἀκελδαμάχ*, Acts i. 19). The singular mistake of Syncellus (*Chron.* ed. Dindorf, i. 525),

who alleges that he was a high priest, can only have arisen from the fact that in the chronicle of Eusebius, which Syncellus makes use of, our Jesus the Son of Sirach is mentioned after the high priest, Simon the son of Onias II., though not as a high priest, but only as the author of the book now under consideration (Euseb. *Chron. ad Ol.* 137–38, ed. Schoene, ii. 122). Again, the notion that he was an ordinary priest is also entirely without foundation, notwithstanding the fact that it has found expression in the text of the *cod. Sinaiticus*, L. 27. The time at which he lived may be determined with tolerable precision. His grandson, who translated the book into Greek, states in the prologue prefixed to it that he (the grandson) came to Egypt ἐν τῷ ὀγδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου βασιλέως. By the “thirty-eighth year” he, of course, does not mean that of his own age, but the thirty-eighth year of the reign of Euergetes. Now seeing that of the two Ptolemys who bore this surname, the one reigned only twenty-five years, it is only the second that can be intended, and whose full name was Ptolemaeus VII. Physcon Euergetes II. This latter in the first instance shared the throne along with his brother (from the year 170 onwards), and subsequently reigned alone (from the year 145 onwards). But he was in the habit of reckoning the years of his reign from the former of those dates. Consequently that thirty-eighth year in which the grandson of Jesus the son of Sirach came to Egypt would be the year 132 B.C. That being the case, his grandfather may be supposed to have lived and to have written his book somewhere between 190 and 170 B.C. This further accords with the fact that in the book (l. 1–26) he pays a respectful tribute to the memory of the high priest, Simon the son of Onias, by whom we are to understand, not Simon I. (in the beginning of the third century, see Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 2. 4), but Simon II. (in the beginning of the second century, see Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 4. 10). Jesus the son of Sirach passes an encomium upon the meritorious character of this personage, who had just passed

away from the world, and the thought of whom was still so fresh in his memory.

The book has come down to us only in the form of the Greek translation which, according to the prologue, was executed by the author's grandson. We further learn from this prologue what is also confirmed by the character of the diction, that the work was originally *composed in Hebrew*, by which we are to understand Hebrew strictly so called and not Aramaic (see Fritzsche, *Exeget. Handbuch*, p. 18). The Hebrew text was still in existence in the time of Jerome, who tells us that he had seen it, see *Praef. in vers. libr. Salom.* (Vallarsi, ix. 1293 sq.): Fertur et *πανάρετος* Jesu filii Sirach liber et alius *ψευδεπίγραφος*, qui Sapiientia Salomonis inscribitur. Quorum priorem Hebraicum reperi, non Ecclesiasticum, ut apud Latinos, sed Parabolas praenotatum, cui juncti erant Ecclesiastes et Canticum Canticorum, ut similitudinem Salomonis non solum librorum numero, sed etiam materiarum genere coaequaret.

The fact that a Hebrew text was still extant in the time of Jerome is evidence of itself that the book was also prized within the circle of Rabbinical Judaism. Not only so, but quotations from it are repeatedly met with in Talmudic literature. But it was prized far more highly still within the Christian Church. It is frequently quoted as *γραφή* by the Greek and the Latin Fathers alike, and that too in the form in which it has come down to us in the manuscripts of the Bible. The restricting of the Christian canon to precisely the same number of books as was in the Hebrew Bible was, in the early Church and that of the Middle Ages, almost always a pure matter of theory, and was only practically recognised and acted upon for the first time in the Protestant Church.

On the quotations from *בן סירא* in Talmudic literature, see Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, i. 257 sqq. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 101 sqq. Delitzsch, *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie*, pp. 20 sq., 204 sq. Dukes, *Rabbinische Blumenlese*, p. 67 sqq. Fritzsche, *Exeget Handbuch*, p. xxxvii. Joel, *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte* (1880), p. 71 sqq. Strack in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vii. 430 sq. We must beware of confounding

with those quotations the very late and apocryphal *Alphabet of Ben Sira*, a collection of 44 (2×22) sayings arranged in alphabetical order. On this see Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, i. 260 sqq., iii. 156 sq. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* iii. 726 sq. Steinschneider, *Catalogus librorum Hebraeorum in bibliotheca Bodleiana* (1852-1860), col. 203-205. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 341. Modern edition, *Alphabetum Siracidis utrumque*, ed. Steinschneider, Berlin 1858.

On the title of our book, see in particular the passage from Jerome quoted above. In the manuscripts it runs thus: *Σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σιράχ*. In the Greek Church the designation *ἡ πανάρετος σοφία*, which according to Euseb., *Hist. eccl.* iv. 22. 8, was in the first instance usually applied to the proverbs of Solomon, came to be extended to our book as well. So for the first time Eusebius, *Chron.* ed. Schoene, ii. 422 (where the conformity on the part of Syncellus and Jerome with the Armenian text serves to show that the expression is peculiar to Eusebius himself). *Demonstr. evang.* viii. 2. 71, ed. Gaisford: *Σίμων, καθ' ὃν Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Σιράχ ἐγνωρίζετο, ὃ τὴν καλουμένην πανάρετον Σοφίαν συντάξας*. This designation does not occur as yet in connection with any of the numerous quotations in Clement and Origen. In the Latin Church *Ecclesiasticus* came to be adopted as the regular title of the book (Cyprian, *Testimon.* ii. 1, iii. 1, 35, 51, 95, 96, 97, 109, 110, 111). Comp. the Latin translation of Origen, *In Numer. homil.* xviii. 3 (ed. Lommatzsch, x. 221): *In libro qui apud nos quidem inter Salomonis volumina haberi solet et Ecclesiasticus dici, apud Graecos vero sapientia Jesu filii Sirach appellatur*.

The use of the book in the Christian Church begins with the New Testament itself. In the Epistle of James, above all, there are unmistakeable reminiscences of it. See in general, Bleek, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, pp. 337 sq., 344-348. Werner, *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1872, p. 265 sqq. The express quotations begin with Clement of Alexandria, who quotes our book times without number, and on most occasions using either the formula *ἡ γραφὴ λέγει, φησὶν* and such like (thirteen times: *Paedag.* i. 8. 62, 8. 68, ii. 2. 34, 5. 46, 8. 69, 8. 76, 10. 98, 10. 99, iii. 3. 17, 3. 23, 4. 29, 11. 58, 11. 83), or *ἡ σοφία λέγει, φησὶν* and such like (nine times: *Paedeg.* i. 8. 69, 8. 72, 9. 75, ii. 1. 8, 2. 24, 7. 54, 7. 58, 7. 59; *Strom.* v. 3. 18); or further, quoting passages now and again as the words of the *παιδαγωγός* (*Paedag.* ii. 10. 99, 101. 109). He speaks of the book as the *σοφία Ἰησοῦ* only twice (*Strom.* i. 4. 27, 10. 47). On one occasion he appears to call Solomon the author (*Strom.* ii. 5. 24); the quotation however is somewhat uncertain. In one instance again an expression in our *σοφία* is described as Sophoclean (*Paedag.* ii. 2. 24). It is very much the same with regard to the quotations in Origen, only here it is impossible in many instances to make out the exact formulae made use of, seeing that the majority of Origen's writings are extant only in Latin translations. Like Clement he also appears to have quoted the book most frequently as *γραφὴ*. In the Latin text Solomon is several times spoken of as the author (*In Numer. homil.* xviii. 3 = Lommatzsch, x. 221; *In Josuam homil.* xi. 2 = Lommatzsch, xi. 108; *In Samuel. homil.* i. 13 = Lommatzsch, xi. 311). But that this cannot be taken as representing the opinion of Origen himself is

proved by the following passage in *contra Cels.* vi. 7 (ed. Lommatzsch, xix. 312): παραδείξωμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων, ὅτι προτρέπει καὶ ὁ θεῖος λόγος ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ διαλεκτικὴν ὅπου μὲν Σολομῶντος λέγοντος . . . ὅπου δὲ τοῦ τοῦ σύγγραμματος τὴν σοφίαν [l. τῆς σοφίας] ἡμῖν καταλιπόντος Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σειράχ φάσκοντος. Cyprian uniformly quotes our book as being a work of Solomon's quite as much as any of the rest of his writings (*Testimon.* ii. 1, iii. 6. 12, 35, 51, 53, 95, 96, 97, 109, 113; *Ad Fortunatum*, chap. ix.; *De opere et eleemosynis*, chap. v.; *Epist.* iii. 2). Similarly other Latin writers. See especially the passage quoted above from the Latin version of Origen, *In Numer. homil.* xviii. 3 (Lommatzsch, x. 221), and also Jerome who, in his *Comment. in Daniel.* chap. ix. (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, v. 686), reproduces the passage from Euseb. *Demonstr. evang.* viii. 2. 71, as follows: Simon, quo regente populum Jesus filius Sirach scripsit librum, qui Graece παναρετός, appellatur et plerisque Salomonis falso dicitur. On the further history of the use of the book in this way, comp. the works and dissertations devoted to the history of the Old Testament canon, also Jahn's *Einleitung in die göttl. Bücher des A. B.* 2nd ed. vol. ii. § 3 and 4 (1803), 1st and 2nd appendices, as well as my article in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* i. 485-489.

The most important *manuscripts* are: (1) The *Vaticanus*, 1209, i.e. the famous Vatican manuscript of the Bible, which however, if we except the eclectic use made of it in the Sixtine edition, has not as yet been made available for the criticism of the text in connection with any edition of our book, not even that of Fritzsche (comp. p. 10). (2) The *Sinaiticus*, in Fritzsche's edition marked No. x. (3) The *Alexandrinus*, in Fritzsche, as in Holmes and Parsons before him, marked No. iii. (4) The fragments of the *Codex Ephraemi*, in Fritzsche = C. (5) A *Venetian* codex, in Fritzsche, who, following Holmes and Parsons, marks it No. xxiii. For further information regarding these manuscripts, see Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. i. 489-491.

On the *editions*, see p. 10, and Herzog's *Real-Enc.* i. 494 sq. Separate edition: *Liber Jesu Siracidae Graece, ad fidem codicum et versionum emendatus et perpetua annotatione illustratus a C. G. Bretschneider*, Ratisb. 1806. For further separate editions, see Herzog's *Real-Enc.* i. 495.

Of the *early translations* the following may be specially mentioned: (1) The *old Latin* one which Jerome did not revise (*praef. in edit. librorum Salmonis juxta Sept. interpretes* [Vallarsi, x. 436]: Porro in eo libro qui a plerisque Sapientia Salomonis inscribitur et in Ecclesiastico, quem esse Jesu filii Sirach nullus ignorat, calamo temperavi, tantummodo canonicas scripturas vobis emendare desiderans). It found its way into the Vulgate, and hence it came to be printed in all subsequent editions of this latter. The variations of four manuscripts (for Jesus the Son of Sirach as well as for the Wisdom of Solomon) are given by Sabatier in his *Bibliorum sacrorum versiones antiquae*, vol. ii. Remis 1743. The text of the *Codex Amiatinus* has been published (for those two books also) by Lagarde in his *Mittheilungen*, 1884. (2) The two *Syrian* versions: (a) The *Peschito* or the Syrian received text, on the editions of which comp. p. 11, (b) the *Syrus hexaplaris* which, for our book as well as for the Wisdom of

Solomon, was edited for the first time from a Milan manuscript by Cerini, *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris, Ambrosianus photolithographice editus*, Mediol. 1874 (forming vol. vii. of the *Monum. Sacra et prof.*). For more on the early versions, see Herzog's *Real-Enc.* i. 491–494. Also texts in the London Polyglot, vol. iv.

For the *exegetical aids* generally, see p. 11. *Commentaries*: Bretschneider in the separate edition previously mentioned. Fritzsche, *Die Weisheit Jesus Sirach's erklärt und übersetzt (Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen, 5 Thl.)*, Leipzig 1859. For the earlier literature, see Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, iii. 718 sqq. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 341 sq. Fritzsche, p. xl. Herzog's *Real-Enc.* i. 496.

Special disquisitions: Gfrörer, *Philo*, vol. ii. (1831) pp. 18–52. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie*, vol. ii. (1834) pp. 126–150. Winer, *De utriusque Siracidae aetate*, Erlang. 1832. Comp. also Winer's *Realwörth.*, art. "Jesus Sirach." Zunz, *Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge der Juden* (1832), pp. 100–105. Ewald, "Ueber das griech. Spruchbuch Jesus' Sohnes Sirach's" (*Jahrb. der bibl. Wissensch.* vol. iii. 1851, pp. 125–140). Bruch, *Weisheitslehre der Hebräer*, 1851, pp. 266–319. Geiger, *Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch.* xii. 1858, pp. 536–543. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 340 sqq. Horowitz, *Das Buch Jesus Sirach*, Breslau 1865. Fritzsche in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* iii. 252 sqq. Grätz, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1872, pp. 49 sqq., 97 sqq. Merguet, *Die Glaubens- und Sittenlehre des Buches Jesus Sirach*, Königsberg 1874. Seligmann, *Das Buch der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach (Josua ben Sira) in seinem Verhältniss zu den salomonischen Sprüchen und seiner historischen Bedeutung*, Breslau 1883. The various introductions of Jahn, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Welte, Scholz, Nöldeke, De Wette-Schrader, Reusch, Keil, Kaulen, Kleinert, Reuss (see p. 12).

2. The Pirke Aboth.

Nor did the gnomic wisdom become extinct in the period following that of Jesus the son of Sirach. Jesus Christ Himself indeed frequently clothed His teaching in this aphoristic form. But besides the work we have just been considering, there is still extant, and that in Hebrew, a collection of such proverbial sayings as we have referred to above, and which, so far at least as its substratum is concerned, belongs to our period, we mean the so-called *Pirke Aboth* (פְּרִקֵּי אָבוֹת, *sayings of the fathers*), known also under the abbreviated form of *Aboth*. This collection was inserted among the tractates of the Mishna (among those of the fourth

division), though strictly speaking it is quite out of place there. For while the rest of the Mishna is simply a codification of Jewish law, our tractate contains a collection of aphorisms after the manner of Jesus the son of Sirach. The only difference is that the *Pirke Aboth* is not the work of a single individual like that book, but a collection of sayings by some sixty learned doctors, who are mentioned by name. The majority of these latter are also otherwise known as distinguished doctors of the law. As a rule each doctor is represented in the work by a couple or more of his characteristic maxims, such as he had been in the habit of inculcating upon his disciples and contemporaries as rules of life well worthy of special consideration. Many of those maxims are of a purely utilitarian character, but the most of them are related in some way or other to the domain of religion; and it is extremely significant as regards the characteristic tendency of this later age that here the importance and necessity of the study of the law are inculcated with quite a special emphasis (comp. the specimens given at Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 44). The authorities whose utterances were collected in this fashion belong for the most part to the age of the Mishna, *i.e.* to the period extending from the year 70 to 170 A.D. Besides these a few, but only a few, of the authorities belonging to earlier times are also taken notice of. The tractate consists of five chapters. In many editions a sixth chapter is added, but it is of much later origin.

Our tractate is given in every edition of the Mishna (on this see § iii. above). In the edition of the Mishna published under Jost's supervision by Lewent in Berlin 1832-1834, there is an excellent German translation printed in the Hebrew character. There is also a Latin version in Surenhusius, *Mishna*, etc. vol. iv. 1702, pp. 409-484. Of the numerous *separate editions* (some of them accompanied with translations) the following may be specially mentioned: P Ewald, *Pirke Aboth oder Sprüche der Vater, übersetzt und erklärt*, Erlangen 1825. Cahn, *Pirke Aboth, sprachlich und sachlich erläutert, erster Perek* (all that has been published), Berlin 1875. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, comprising *Pirke Aboth* and *Perek R. Meir* in Hebrew and English, with critical and illustrative notes, etc., Cambridge 1877 (where the text is given exactly in accordance with a

Cambridge manuscript, *University Addit.* 470. 1). Strack, פרקי אבות, *Die Sprüche der Väter, ein ethischer Mischna-Traktat, mit kurzer Einleitung, Anmerkungen und einem Wortregister*, 1882 (where additional literature is to be found in the introduction).

IV. HORTATORY NARRATIVE.

1. *The Book of Judith.*

The hortatory narrative was a peculiar species of literature which was frequently cultivated during our period. Stories of a purely fictitious character were composed which the author no doubt intended to be regarded as founded on fact, though at the same time the object in view was not so much to impart historical information, as to use these stories as a vehicle for conveying moral and religious lessons and exhortations. From the incidents narrated—and which are taken from the history of the Jewish people, or from the life of certain individuals—the readers are expected to learn the truth that the fear of God is after all the highest wisdom, for God always delivers His children in some wonderful way in the end, although for a little He may bring them into circumstances of trouble and danger.

The history of Judith is a narrative of this description. The following is an outline of the story. Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Assyria (*sic* !), calls upon the peoples of Asia Minor, and among them the inhabitants of Palestine, to furnish him with troops to help him in the war he was waging against Arphaxad the king of Media. As those who received this summons did not think proper to comply with it, Nebuchadnezzar, as soon as he had vanquished Arphaxad, sent his general, Holofernes, with a large force against the nations of the West, with the view of chastising them for their disobedience. Holofernes executes his orders, devastates the various countries one after another, and demolishes their sanctuaries in order that Nebuchadnezzar alone might receive the worship due to God (i.—iii.). When he got as far as the

plain of Esdrelon, the Jews, who had just returned from the captivity, and had newly re-established their worship (*sic!* in Nebuchadnezzar's time), prepare to offer resistance. By order of Joakim, the high priest, they intercept Holofernes on his way to Jerusalem at Fort Betylua (*Βετυλούα*; Latin, Bethulia), opposite the plain of Esdrelon (iv.-vi.).⁹ Now when Holofernes was besieging Betylua, and the distress within the town had reached a climax, a wealthy, beautiful, and pious widow called Judith resolved to save her people by an act of daring (vii.-ix.). Richly attired, and having no one with her but a bondwoman, she betakes herself to the enemy's camp, and there, under the pretext of wishing to show him how to get to Jerusalem, she contrives to obtain an interview with Holofernes. This latter reposes confidence in her, and is charmed with her beauty. After spending three days in the camp she is called upon to be present at a banquet, at the conclusion of which she is left alone with Holofernes in his tent. But the general is so intoxicated with wine that Judith now finds an opportunity for carrying out her design. She accordingly takes Holofernes's own sword and cuts off his head with it. She then manages to get away from the camp without being observed, while the slave brings away the head of Holofernes in a bag. Having thus accomplished her object,

* The town of *Βετυλούα* (Bethulia) is mentioned nowhere else (except by Christian pilgrims who, on the ground of our story, point sometimes to one place and sometimes to another, as the spot where it stood). That the town actually existed however is hardly to be doubted, for it is scarcely likely that the author would also have to invent an artificial geography to suit his story. On the probable site of the place, see Robinson's *Palestine*, iii. pp. 337 sq. Idem, *Modern Biblical Researches*, p. 443. Fritzsche in Schenkel's *Bibellez.* i. 431. Guérin, *Samarie*, i. pp. 344-350. The Palestine pilgrim Theodosius (ed. Gildemeister, 1882) speaks in § xx. of Betulia, *ubi Olofernes mortuus est*, as being in the extreme south of Palestine, twelve miles south of Raphia. There no doubt a place of this name must have existed (see Wesseling, *Vetera Romanorum itineraria*, p. 719. Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerliche Verfassung des römischen Reichs*, ii. 367 sq. Gildemeister's notes to Theodosius). But this cannot have been the locality in question, for our Betylua must have been much farther north, *viz.* in Samaria.

she returns to Betylua, where she is welcomed with great rejoicings (x.—xiii.). When the enemy discovered what had been done they fled in all directions, and were without difficulty mown down by the Jews. But Judith was extolled by all Israel as their deliverer (xiv.—xvi.).

As our book happens to have found a place in the Christian Bible, not only Catholic but also many Protestant theologians have felt it to be their duty to defend the historical character of the narrative (as was still done, on the Protestant side, above all by O. Wolff, 1861). But the historical blunders are so gross, and the hortatory purpose so obvious, that one cannot venture to assume even a nucleus of fact. The book is a piece of fiction composed with the view of encouraging the people to offer a brave resistance to the enemies of their religion and their liberties. The standpoint of the author is already entirely that of Pharisaic legalism. It is precisely the scrupulous care with which she observes the laws regarding purifications and meats that is so much admired in Judith, while it is plainly enough intimated that it was just for this reason that she had had God upon her side. But the story points to a time when danger threatened not only the people themselves, but their religion as well. For Holofernes demands that Nebuchadnezzar should be worshipped instead of God. This is suggestive of Daniel and the Maccabaeon age. Consequently the origin of the book may with great probability be referred to this period (so also Fritzsche, for example, and Ewald, Hilgenfeld 1861, Nöldeke). Seeing that the author appears to be quite as deeply interested in political as in religious liberty, probably we ought to understand him as referring, not to the earlier days of the insurrection, but to a somewhat later period. It would hardly be advisable to come so far down as the Roman age, for the political background (the high priest as supreme head of the Jewish commonwealth, the Hellenistic cities as independent towns, and subject to the suzerain only to the extent of having to furnish troops in time of war) corresponds far more with the Greek

than the Roman period. It is entirely out of the question to refer the composition of the book to the time of Trajan (so Hitzig, Grätz, and above all Volkmar, who finds in it a disguised account of Trajan's campaigns); for the story of Judith was already known to Clement of Rome (toward the end of the first century of our era).

Jerome had the book before him in a Chaldee text (see below). How far this agreed with or differed from our Greek text we are not in a position to say exactly, for we have no means of knowing to what extent Jerome followed the Chaldee text when he was preparing the Latin one. In any case, judging from internal grounds, it is tolerably certain—and moreover almost universally acknowledged—that our Greek text is a translation of a Hebrew (or Aramaic) original (see Movers in the article mentioned below, and Fritzsche, *Handb.* p. 115 sq.).

In the time of Origen the book was not in use *among the* (Palestinian) *Jews*, nor was any Hebrew text of it known to exist, for in *Epist. ad African.* chap. xiii. he says: Ἑβραῖοι τῇ Ταβίτᾳ οὐ χρῶνται οὐδὲ τῇ Ἰουδήθ· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔχουσιν αὐτὰ ἐν ἀποκρύφοις ἑβραϊστί· ὡς ἀπ' αὐτῶν μαθόντες ἐγνώκαμεν. It may therefore be conjectured that the Hebrew original was lost at an early period, and that the Chaldee text, with which Jerome was acquainted, was a later version based upon the Greek one. For yet later Jewish versions, see Zunz, *Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge der Juden*, p. 124 sq. Lipsius, "Jüdische Quellen zur Judithsage" (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1867, pp. 337–366).

Use in the Christian Church: Clement of Rome, chap. lv.: Ἰουδὴθ καὶ μακαρία. Tertullian, *De monogam.* chap. xvii.: Nec Joannes aliqui Christi spado, nec Judith filia Merari nec tot alia exempla sanctorum (!). Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* ii. 7. 35, iv. 19. 118 (Judith being expressly mentioned in the latter passage). Origen, *Fragm. ex libro sexto Stromatum*, in Jerome, *adv. Rufin.* Book I. (Lommatzsch, xvii. 69 sq.): Homo autem, cui incumbit necessitas mentiendi, diligenter attendat, ut sic utatur interdum mendacio, quomodo condimento atque medicamine; ut servet mensuram ejus, ne excedat terminos, quibus usa est Judith contra Holophernem et vicit eum prudenti simulatione verborum. Further quotations in Origen are to be found: *Comm. in Joann.* vol. ii. chap. xvi. (Lommatzsch, xi. 279). In *Lib. Judicum homil.* ix. 1 (Lommatzsch, xi. 279); *De Oratione*, chap. xiii. (Lommatzsch, xvii. 134); *De Oratione*, chap. xxix. (Lommatzsch, xvii. 246). For the further history of the use, see the history of the canon.

The Greek text exists in three different recensions: (1) The original text, which is that given in the majority of manuscripts, and among others also

in the Codex Vaticanus (marked in the critical apparatuses as No. ii.), Alexandrinus (No. iii.) and Sinaiticus (No. x.). (2) A revised text, viz. that of Codex 58 (according to numbering of the manuscripts in Holmes and Parsons). It is on this text also that the Latin and Syriac versions are based. (3) Another recension, though akin to the one just mentioned, is to be found in Codices 19 and 108. *On the editions*, see p. 10.

Of the *early versions* the following call for special mention in the case of our book as well: (1) The *Latin*, and that (a) the *Vetus Latinus* (previous to Jerome), for which Sabatier collated five manuscripts, in which the deviations from each other are found to be so great as entirely to corroborate what Jerome says about the *multorum codicum varietas vitiosissima* in his day (Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. i. Remis 1743, pp. 744-790). On the relation of the texts to one another and to the Greek text, see Fritzsche's *Commentar*, p. 118 sqq. (b) Jerome's translation (= *Vulgata*), on the origin of which he himself says in the preface (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, x. 21 sq.): *Apud Hebraeos liber Judith inter apocrypha (al. hagiographa) legitur . . . Chaldaeo tamen sermone conscriptus inter historias computatur. Sed quia hunc librum Synodus Nicaena in numero sanctarum scripturarum legitur computasse, acquievi postulationi vestrae, inmo exactioni, et sepositis occupationibus, quibus vehementer arctabar, huic unam lucubratiunculam dedi, magis sensum ■ sensu quam ex verbo verbum transferens. Multorum codicum varietatem vitiosissimam amputavi: sola ea, quae intelligentia integra in verbis Chaldaeis invenire potui, Latinis expressi.* According to this, his own confession, the work is a free rendering and one too that was executed somewhat hurriedly. It was based upon the old Latin version. Comp. Fritzsche's *Commentar*, p. 121 sq. For the criticism of the text, see Thielmann, *Beiträge zur Textkritik der Vulgata, insbesondere des Buches Judith*, a school program, Speier 1883. (2) The *Syriac Version*, on which and its editions see p. 11. The London Polyglot gives, in addition to the Greek text, only the Latin Vulgate and the Syriac version.

For the *exegetical aids* generally, see p. 11. Commentaries: Fritzsche, *Die Bücher Tobi und Judith erklärt* (*Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen*, 2 vols.), Leipzig 1853. O. Wolff, *Das Buch Judith als geschichtliche Urkunde vertheidigt und erklärt*, Leipzig 1861. The older literature in Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, iii. 736-738. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, ii. 51 (under "Jehudit"). Volkmar, *Handb. der Einl. in die Apokryphen*, i. 1 (1860), pp. 3-5. Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. i. 496.

Special disquisitions: Montfaucon, *La vérité de l'histoire de Judith*, Paris 1690. Movers, "Ueber die Ursprache der deuterokanonischen Bücher des A. T." (*Zeitschr. für Philos. und kathol. Theol.*, Part 13, 1835, p. 31 sqq. [on Judith exclusively]). Schoenhaupt, *Etudes historiques et critiques sur le livre de Judith*, Strasb. 1839. Reuss, art. "Judith," in Ersch and Gruber's *Allg. Enc.* § ii. vol. xxviii. (1851) p. 98 sqq. Nickes, *De libro Judithae*, Vratislav. 1854. *Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record*, vol. iii. 1856, pp. 342-363, vol. xii. 1861, pp. 421-440. Volkmar, "Die Composition des Buches Judith" (*Theol. Jahrb.* 1857, pp. 441-498). Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1858, pp. 270-281. R. A.

Lipsius, *ibid.* 1859, pp. 39-121. Hitzig, *ibid.* 1860, pp. 240-250. Volkmar, *Handbuch der Einleitung in die Apokryphen*, Part 1, Div. 1, Judith, 1860. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1861, pp. 335-385. K. H. A. Lipsius, "Sprachliches zum Buche Judith" (*Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1862, pp. 103-105). Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. iv. (3rd ed. 1864) p. 618 sq. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vol. iv. (2nd ed. 1866) note 14, p. 439 sqq. R. A. Lipsius, "Judische Quellen zur Judithsage" (*Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1867, pp. 337-366). Fritzsche in Schenkel's *Bibellez.* iii. 445 sqq. The introductions of Jahn, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Welte, Scholz, Nöldeke, De Wette-Schrader, Reusch, Keil, Kaulen, Kleinert, Reuss (see p. 12).

2. *The Book of Tobit.*

The Book of Tobit is a work of a similar character to that of Judith, only it does not move in the domain of political history, but in that of biography, though like it it addresses its exhortations not to the people at large, but to the individual reader. Tobit, the son of Tobiel, of the tribe of Naphtali, who, in the days of Shalmaneser king of Assyria, had been taken captive to Nineveh, relates how, both before and after going into captivity, even under the succeeding kings Sennacherib and Esarhaddon, he, and his wife Anna, and his son Tobias, had always lived in strict accordance with the requirements of the law. Besides this he had been particularly in the habit of interring the bodies of such of his countrymen as had been put to death by the Assyrians and allowed to lie unburied. One day, after performing a kind service of this sort, he lay down to sleep in the open air (in order that, defiled as he was by contact with a dead body, he might not communicate the defilement to his house), when some sparrow's dung fell upon his eyes, in consequence of which he lost his sight (i.-iii. 6). At the same time there was living in Ecbatana in Media a pious Jewess called Sarah, the daughter of Raguel, who already had had seven husbands, but all of whom had been put to death on the marriage night by the evil spirit Asmodeus (iii. 7-17). Meanwhile the aged Tobit remembered, in the midst of his distress, that on one occasion he had left ten talents of silver at Rages in Media, in charge

of one Gabael a member of his own tribe. Consequently when he saw that his end was approaching he sent his son Tobias to Rages with instructions to get the money, which he was to retain as his patrimony. Tobias sets out, taking with him a fellow-traveller, this latter however being, in reality, no other than the angel Raphael (iv.-v.). On his way Tobias bathes in the Tigris and, while doing so, he catches a fish. At the angel's behest he takes out the fish's heart, liver and gall, and carries them away with him. Having now reached Ecbatana they take up their quarters at the house of Raguel. This latter recognises in Tobias one of her own relations and gives him her daughter Sarah to be his wife. As soon as the new-married couple had entered the bride-chamber, Tobias, acting on the instructions of the angel, raises a smoke by burning the heart and the liver of the fish, which had the effect of expelling the demon Asmodeus, who was bent on disposing of him too precisely as he had disposed of the former husbands of Sarah. Thus the fourteen days of marriage festivity were allowed to pass by without disturbance or interruption, the angel having meanwhile taken the opportunity to go to Rages to get the money from Gabael (vi.-ix.). After the marriage celebrations were over Tobias returns to Nineveh to his parents accompanied by Sarah his wife, and there he contrives to cure his father's blindness by anointing his eyes with the gall of the fish (x.-xii.). Full of gratitude to God, Tobit chants a song of praise, and continues to live for nearly a hundred years longer. Tobias also lives to the age of 127 years (xiii.-xiv.).

The plot of the story is well contrived, there is great variety of details, and the various threads joined on at different points in the narrative are skilfully interwoven with each other. Consequently as a literary product our book is decidedly superior to that of Judith. But the religious standpoint is exactly the same. Here too, as in Judith, the whole stress is laid upon the strict observance of the law, of which the practice of deeds of kindness also forms a part.

And in connection with this, we at the same time get some instructive glimpses of the superstition of the time. As the whole story centres in the dispersion, it would seem from this that the author wrote mainly for the *Jews of the dispersion*. By holding up those patterns of excellence before the eyes of his readers he hopes to produce such an impression upon the minds of those of his countrymen scattered among the Gentiles as may lead them to adhere no less faithfully to the law, and to observe it in an equally strict and conscientious manner. In consequence of the purpose of the book being as here described, it is impossible to determine whether it had its origin in Palestine or in the dispersion.

The date of the composition of the work can only be fixed within tolerably wide limits. Comparatively speaking, it may be regarded as most certain of all that the book was written *previous to the building of the temple of Herod*. No doubt Hitzig thought (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1860, p. 250 sqq.) that we were bound to assume that it was written after the destruction of the temple by Titus, because among the predictions at the close of the book it is above all foretold that the temple will be rebuilt again with great magnificence (xiii. 16 f., xiv. 4, 5). But on more careful consideration we will find it probable that the author wrote when the temple of Zerubbabel was still standing. He places himself at the standpoint of the Assyrian age, and from this he predicts first of all the destruction of the temple by the Chaldaeans, and then its reconstruction, where however he distinguishes between two things: (1) the restoration of an unpretending structure till the lapse of a definite period; and (2) the rebuilding with extraordinary magnificence and splendour that is to take place at the expiry of this period (xiv. 5: *καὶ οἰκοδομήσουσι τὸν οἶκον, οὐχ οἶος ὁ πρότερος, ἕως πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπιστρέψουσιν ἐκ τῶν αἰχμαλωσιῶν καὶ οἰκοδομήσουσιν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐντίμως· καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος οἰκοδομῇ ἐνδόξῳ, καθὼς ἐλάλησαν περὶ αὐτῆς οἱ προφῆται*).

The *historical structure* with which the author is acquainted is therefore more unpretending than the former one, the temple of Solomon (οὐχ οἶος ὁ πρότερος). For surely he could hardly have expressed himself as he does if he was already acquainted with the temple of Herod. If this latter then forms the *terminus ad quem* for the composition of our book, the safest course would be to say that it was written *in the course of the last two centuries before Christ*. For we are precluded by the whole spirit of the book from going farther back.

In preparing his Latin version of our book Jerome made use of a *Chaldee text* precisely as in the case of the Book of Judith (see below). Such a text is *still extant* in the shape of a manuscript that only at a comparatively recent date found its way into the Bodleian library at Oxford, from which Neubauer took his edition (*The Book of Tobit, a Chaldee text*, etc., ed. by Neubauer, Oxford 1878). Both texts, the Latin of Jerome and the Chaldee one, are marked by a singular peculiarity common to themselves, and to themselves alone. The peculiarity in question is this, that while, according to the Greek text and the other versions, Tobit in the first section (i. 1—iii. 6) tells his story in the *first* person, and only changes to the *third* after Sarah makes her appearance in the narrative, Jerome and the author of the Chaldee text, on the other hand, make use of the third person from beginning to end. From this it is highly probable that Jerome had before him, if not exactly our Chaldee text, at all events one very much akin to it (that our Chaldee text is only the reproduction of an older one is probable for other reasons, see below). But the peculiarity just referred to also serves to prove at the same time that our Chaldee text is *not* based upon the Greek one. For the inserting of the third person all through is clearly an afterthought, while the transition from the first to the third correctly represents the original text. *But there is no ground whatever for supposing that our Greek text is a version based upon a Semitic original.* For the

two Hebrew texts, which were printed in the sixteenth century, are also later products (see below). On the other hand, there are numerous peculiarities of diction (for example the phrase *καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός*, vii. 7) which serve to confirm the view that the Greek must have been the original text.¹⁰

It would appear, from what Origen asserts, that in his time our book was not in use among the (Palestinian) Jews, and that a Hebrew text was unheard of (Origen, *Epist. ad African.* chap. xiii.; for the terms of the passage, see p. 35. Idem, *De oratione*, chap. xiv. = Lommatzsch, xvii. 143: *τῇ δὲ τοῦ Τωβίτ βίβλῳ ἀντιλέγουσιν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς ὡς μὴ ἐνδιαθῆκω*). But that it came to be received with favour not long after is proved by the existing Semitic manuscripts, with one of which Jerome was already acquainted.

Its use in the Christian Church is already evidenced by the apostolic Fathers. Comp. 2 Clem. xvi. 4 = Tobit xii. 8 (on which see Harnack's notes to 2 Clem.). *Epist. Polycarp.* x. 2 = Tobit iv. 10. According to Irenaeus, i. 30. 11, the Ophites included Tobias among the Old Testament prophets. Clement of Alexandria repeatedly quotes the book as *γραφὴ* (*Strom.* ii. 23. 139, vi. 12. 102). Hippolytus in his commentary on the story of Susannah brings in the story of Tobit by way of parallel (Hippolyt. ed. Lagarde, p. 151). Origen in his *Epist. ad African.* refers at some length to the story of Tobias, and adds quite in a general way: *χρῶνται τῷ Τωβίᾳ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι*. Consequently he in like manner frequently quotes it as *γραφὴ* (*Comment. in epist. ad Rom.* book viii. chap. xi. *fin.* = Lommatzsch, vii. 272; *De oratione*, chap. xi. = Lommatzsch, xvii. 124; comp. besides, *De oratione*, chaps. xiv. and xxxi. = Lommatzsch, xvii. 143, 284; *contra Cels.* v. 19 = Lommatzsch, xix. 196). Cyprian makes frequent use of the book (*Testimon.* iii. 1, 6, 62; *Ad Fortunatum*, chap. xi.; *De opere et eleemosynis*, chaps. v. and xx.). For more on this subject, see the works on the history of the Canon; also Jahn's *Einleit. in die göttl. Bücher des Alten Bundes*, 2nd ed. vol. ii. § 3 and 4 (1803), 1st and 2nd appendices.

Of the Greek text there are three recensions in existence: (1) The one found in the majority of manuscripts, and among others also in *Codex Vaticanus* (No. ii.) and *Alexandrinus* (No. iii.). To it the Syrian version adheres as far as chap. vii. 9. (2) The text of the *Codex Sinaiticus* (No. x.), which deviates very much from the ordinary text. To it again the old Latin version adheres, though not entirely yet chiefly. (3) The text of *Codices* 44, 106 and 107 (according to the numbering of Holmes and Parsons), which is akin to that of the *Codex Sinaiticus*. However, this latter appears to have been adhered to by the manuscripts just mentioned only from vi. 9 to xiii. 8, while in all that precedes and follows they conform to the ordinary recension. This text again is that on which,

¹⁰ Comp. also Fritzsche's *Commentar*, p. 8. Nöldeke, *Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1879, p. 61.

from vii. 10 onwards, the Syrian version is based. Whether the ordinary text or that of the *Codex Sinaiticus* is the original one it is difficult to determine, for the claims of both admit of being well supported. Fritzsche (*Proleg.* to his edition), and Nöldeke (*Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie*), 1879, p. 45 sqq., decide in favour of the ordinary text, while Reusch (in his separate edition; comp. also *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1878, p. 333 sq.) upholds the claims of the *Codex Sinaiticus*. In Fritzsche's edition of the Apocrypha the whole three texts are printed alongside of each other. The text of the *Codex Sinaiticus* has been published separately by Reusch (*Libellus Tobit e codice Sinaitico editus et recensitus*, Bonnæ 1870). Comp. further on the editions, p. 10.

Of the *early versions* we may mention: (1) The *Latin*, and that (*a*) the *old Latin one*, the text of which shows very considerable variations in the four manuscripts collated by Sabatier, though it substantially agrees with that of the *Codex Sinaiticus* (Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. i.). Sabatier's four manuscripts represent two recensions, the one of which is contained in three of them, and the other in the remaining one (*Vat.* 7).¹¹ Fragments of a third recension are furnished by the quotations given in the *Speculum Augustini* (on which see Reusch, *Das Buch Tobias*, 1857, p. xxvi.), edited by Mai. The text of a certain *Codex Ambrosianus* has not yet been inspected. Ceriani contemplates preparing an edition of it for the *Monum. sacra et profana*, but so far as I am aware it has not as yet appeared. The same may be said of a Munich codex, which Ziegler purposes editing (Neubauer, *The Book of Tobit*, p. 10, note 6). See in general, Ilgen, *Die Geschichte Tobit's*, p. 183 sqq. Fritzsche, *Handb.* p. 11 sq. Reusch, *Das Buch Tobias*, p. 25 sqq. Sengelmann, *Das Buch Tobit*, pp. 49-56. (*b*) Jerome's version (= *Vulgata*), which was executed in circumstances similar to those under which that of Judith was prepared, see *Praef. in vers. libri Tob.* (Vallarsi, x. 1 sq.): Exigitis, ut librum Chaldaeo sermone conscriptum ad Latinum stilum traham, librum utique Tobiae, quem Hebraei de catalogo divinarum scripturarum secantes his quae apocrypha [al. hagiographa] memorant manciparunt. Feci satis desiderio vestro . . . Et quia vicina est Chaldaeorum lingua sermoni Hebraico, utriusque linguae peritissimum loquacem reperiens, unius diei laborem arripui, et quidquid ille mihi Hebraicis verbis expressit, hoc ego accito notario sermonibus Latinis exposui. A comparison of this version with the old Latin one will show that Jerome based his translation upon this latter, giving a somewhat free rendering of it, however much he may, at the same time, have kept the Chaldee text in view. Comp. Ilgen, p. cxliv. sqq. Fritzsche, p. xii. sq. Reusch, p. xxxii. Sengelmann, pp. 56-61. We have no further means of verification notwithstanding the recovery of the Chaldee text, for this latter is itself simply a reproduction, with greater or less accuracy, of the original one. (2) The *Syriac* text which has come down to

¹¹ The text of *Vaticanus* 7 has (according to Reusch, *Libellus Tobit*, 1870, p. 4) been more carefully edited by Bianchini, *Vindiciae canonicarum scripturarum*, Romae 1740, p. cccl., than by Sabatier. On this text comp. also Bickell, *Zeitschr. für kathol. Theol.* 1878, p. 218.

ns (printed for the first time in the *London Polyglot*, vol. iv.) is composed of the fragments of two different versions, one of which (as far as vii. 9) followed the ordinary Greek text, while the other (from vii. 10 onwards) followed the text of Codices 44, 106, 107. See Ilgen, pp. cxxxvii. sq., clxix. sqq. Reusch, p. xx. sq. Sengelmann, p. 47 sq. On the editions, see p. 11. The Book of Tobit is not given in the large Peschito manuscript of Milan.

(3) The *Chaldee* text (see p. 40 above), edited by Neubauer, agrees substantially with the Greek recension of the *Codex Sinaiticus* on which it was probably based. But the text as we now have it is in all likelihood only an abridged and modified form of an older Chaldee text. See, besides Neubauer's edition, Bickell, *Zeitschr. für kathol. Theol.* 1878, pp. 216–222, and especially Nöldeke, *Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1879, pp. 45–69.

(4) Lastly, we have further to mention *two Hebrew versions* which have been frequently printed since the sixteenth century, namely: (a) The so-called *Hebraeus Fagii*, a Hebrew version based upon the ordinary Greek text published first of all at Constantinople in 1517, and then by Fagius in 1542. On this see Ilgen, p. cxxxviii. sqq. Fritzsche, p. 9 sq. Reusch, p. xlvii. Sengelmann, p. 63 sq. (b) The *Codex Hebraeus Münsteri*, a free Hebrew version which (according to Neubauer, p. 12) was published first at Constantinople in 1516, and then by Sebastian Münster in 1542. Until the discovery of the Chaldee text it was supposed that the old Latin version was based upon it (so Ilgen, p. ccxvii. sqq.; Fritzsche, p. 14; Reusch, p. xlvii. sq.; Sengelmann, p. 61 sqq.). After seeing the Chaldee text, we cannot but regard it as certain that the *Codex Hebraeus Münsteri* is based upon it, though not on that text as it has come down to us, but on an older form of it. See especially Nöldeke as above; also Bickell as above. As in the Greek text, so also in this older form, the first person was made use of in the first three chapters, and this has also been retained in the *Codex Heb. Münst.* Neubauer has published an excellent edition of this codex based upon a collation of two manuscripts, and accompanied with an English translation (*The Book of Tobit, a Chaldee text*, etc., ed. by Neubauer, Oxford 1878). Both the Hebrew texts along with a Latin translation have also found a place in the *London Polyglot*, vol. iv. On the earlier editions, comp. Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, i. 391 sqq., ii. 413 sq., iii. 275, iv. 154. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* iii. 738 sq. Steinschneider, *Catalogus librorum Hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana* (1852–1860), cols. 200–202. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 425.

For the *exegetical aids* generally, see p. 11, above. Commentaries: Ilgen, *Die Geschichte Tobit's nach drei verschiedenen Originalen, dem Griechischen dem Lateinischen des Hieronymus und einem Syrischen übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen exegetischen und kritischen Inhalts auch einer Einleitung versehen*, Jena 1800. Fritzsche, *Die Bücher Tobit und Judith erklärt (Exeget. Handb. zu den Apokryphen*, vol. ii.), Leipzig 1853. Reusch, *Das Buch Tobias übersetzt und erklärt*, Freiburg 1857. Sengelmann, *Das Buch Tobit erklärt*, Münster 1877. For the older literature, consult Fabricius-Harles, iii. 738 sq. Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii. 425 sq. Fritzsche, p. 20. Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. i. 496.

Special disquisitions: [Eichhorn], "Ueber das Buch Tobias" (*Allgem. Bibliothek bibl. Literatur*, ii. 410 sqq.). Reusch, "Der Dämon Asmodäus im B. Tobias" (*Theol. Quartalschr.* 1856, pp. 422-445). Idem, Review of Sengelmann, in the *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1858, pp. 318-332. *Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record*, iv. 1857, pp. 59-71, vi. 1858, pp. 373-382. Hitzig, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1860, pp. 250-261. Hilgenfeld, *ibid.* 1862, pp. 181-198. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. iv. (3rd ed.) p. 269 sqq. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vol. iv. (2nd ed.) p. 466 sq. note 17. Kohut, "Etwas über die Moral und die Abfassungszeit d. B. Tobias" (Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissenschaft u. Leben*, x. 1872, pp. 49-73; also in a separate form). Fritzsche in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* v. 540 sqq. Renan, *L'église chrétienne* (1879), pp. 554-561. Grätz, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1879, pp. 145 sqq., 385 sqq., 433 sqq., 509 sqq. Grimm, *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1881, pp. 33-56. Preiss, *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1885, pp. 24-51. The introductions of Jahn, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Welte, Scholz, Nöldeke, De Wette-Schrader, Reusch, Keil, Kaulen, Kleinert, Reuss (see p. 12).

V. PSEUDEPIGRAPHIC PROPHECIES.

The whole of the literary products hitherto mentioned were fashioned more or less after the models of the older and by that time the canonical literature, to which moreover they made the closest approximation both in point of spirit and matter. We have now a new species of literature, and one that, in our period, was more popular and influential than any other, namely, the *pseudepigraphic prophecies*. The old prophets, in their teachings and exhortations, addressed themselves directly to the people, and that first and foremost through their oral utterances and then, but only as subordinate to these, by means of written discourse as well. But now when men felt themselves impelled at any time by their religious enthusiasm to try to influence their contemporaries through their teaching and exhortations, instead of directly addressing them in person like the prophets of old, they did so by a writing purporting to be the work of some one or other of the great names of the past, in the hope that in this way the effect would be all the surer and all the more powerful. We may venture to regard the predilection shown for the kind of medium here in question as evidence of the

somewhat degenerate character of the age. It shows that there were natures of a highly religious cast who nevertheless had no longer the courage to confront their contemporaries with the proud claim to have their words listened to as the words of God Himself, but who rather seemed to think it necessary to conceal themselves under the guise of some one or other of the acknowledged authorities of the olden time. And so for this reason all the writings of a prophetic character that make their appearance in our period are *pseudepigraphic*. They are given to the world bearing the name of an *Enoch*, a *Moses*, a *Baruch*, an *Ezra*, or of the *twelve patriarchs*, but we do not know who the real author is of any one of them. Then the standpoint of the pseudonymous author to whom the work is ascribed is, as a rule, skilfully maintained throughout. The writings are composed in such a way as to make it appear as though they had actually been intended for the contemporaries of the respective personages whose names they bear. But what is addressed to those assumed contemporaries is in reality of such a nature that it concerns rather more the contemporaries of the real author himself. From his artificially assumed standpoint the writer looks on into the future and predicts, often with considerable detail, the future history of Israel and the world, but always taking care to see that predictions stop short at his (the real author's) own time, and so to arrange matters as to make it appear that this was also to be the time of judgment and of the dawn of redemption alike, and all this for the purpose of serving as a warning to sinners on the one hand and to comfort and encourage the godly on the other. The fact that the alleged predictions are seen to have been already fulfilled in the previous history of Israel and the world, serves at the same time to inspire confidence in the prophet so that there will now be a readier disposition to believe him when he predicts what (from the standpoint of the real contemporaries) still lies in the future.

The *contents* of those pseudepigraphic prophecies are of a very varied description. As in the older prophetic writings,

so also in these two things were as a rule combined with each other, viz. *instruction* and *exhortation*. Prominence is given sometimes to the one and sometimes to the other, to the former for example in the Book of Enoch, to the latter in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. But in no case is one or other of them found to be entirely absent. The exhortation is uniformly based upon the previous instruction, while the religious instruction thus imparted always aims at stimulating the reader to a behaviour of a corresponding nature. But the character of the writings varied very much according as one or other of those elements happened to predominate in them. At one time they give one more the impression of moral sermons (as for example the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs), at another they are more concerned with the unveiling of divine mysteries (as in the case of the Book of Enoch). Yet however much they may thus differ from one another, they all belong, so far as their essential character is concerned, to one and the same category. The revelations given in them, in due keeping with their hortatory purpose, have reference first of all to the history of the Jewish people and of mankind in general, but they also concern themselves, though only in a more subordinate way, with certain theological problems, such as the question regarding the connection between sin and calamity on the one hand and righteousness and prosperity on the other. But besides this they also seek to enlighten the reader with regard to the mysteries of nature, the supernatural and heavenly background of the operations of the natural world. On all those matters, which are more or less remotely connected with the religious life, they claim to give authentic information.

The *form* in which those communications are clothed is that of *apocalypse*. They claim throughout to be supernatural revelations given to mankind by the mouth of those men of God in whose names the various writings appear. The peculiarity of this later "apocalyptic" medium as distinguished from the older genuine prophecy is this, that it imparts its

revelations not in clear and plain language, but in a mysterious *enigmatical form*. The thing intended to be communicated is veiled under parables and symbols, the meaning of which can only be guessed at. However, the extent to which this veiling is carried is not always the same. At one time it only goes the length of the author's abstaining from mentioning the *names* of persons that are otherwise plainly enough indicated, while at another again the whole thing is symbolical from beginning to end. Persons are represented under the symbolism of animals, events in the history of the human race under that of the operations of nature. And if, as sometimes happens, the interpretation is added, this latter again is only a less obscure form of the enigma and not a solution of it.

The majority of those writings were *occasioned* by times of trouble and distress, or by the depressed circumstances of the people generally. It is the contradiction that is found to exist between the ideal and the actual, between the promises which God has given to His people and the existing bondage and persecution which they had to endure at the hands of Gentile powers,—it was this contradiction I say that impelled their authors to write those works. And where no present trouble or persecution actually existed, the motive for writing may be looked for in the pessimistic view of things which they were cherishing at the time. The existing state of matters, the present condition of the chosen people, was felt to be a glaring contradiction to its true destiny. Such a state of things could not last, an entire revolution must of necessity take place and that ere long. Such is the conviction to which expression is given in the whole of the writings now in question. They therefore owe their origin, on the one hand, to a pessimistic view of the present and, on the other, to an intense faith in the glorious future of the people. And the *object* at which their authors aim is to awaken and quicken the same faith in others as well. They insist that there must be no such thing as doubting, but rather a clinging

with all steadfastness to the belief that God will conduct His people safely through all the afflictions which He has been sending upon them in order to test and purify them, and bring them at length to greatness and glory. This belief must meanwhile comfort and encourage the people in the midst of their present sufferings. But inasmuch as the revolution in question is represented as being near at hand, the wicked are meant at the same time to take warning from this and repent so long as there is an opportunity to do so. For the coming judgment will be a right stern one, bringing salvation to the godly and perdition to the wicked. The actual *effect* of those enthusiastic predictions appears to have been both powerful and lasting. Through them the Messianic hope was quickened, through them the people were confirmed in the belief that they were called not to serve but to rule. But it is for this very reason that this apocalyptic literature has played so important a part in developing the political sentiments of the people. If we find that, from the date of the tax imposed by Quirinius, whereby Judaea was placed directly under Roman administration, revolutionary tendencies among the people grew stronger and stronger year by year till they led at last to the great insurrection of the year 66, then there cannot be a doubt that this process was essentially promoted if not exclusively caused by the apocalyptic literature.

The standpoint of the whole of those writings is essentially that of orthodox Judaism. They exhort to a God-fearing behaviour in accordance with the regulative principles of the law, and deplore the tendency to disregard the law that was manifesting itself here and there. But, at the same time, it is not the official Judaism of the Pharisaic scribes to which expression is given here. The principal stress is laid not on what the people have *to do*, but on what they have *to expect*. In regard to the former of these, viz. conduct, matters are treated more in their general aspect, without any special stress being laid exactly upon scholastic correctness in details. We should further add that neither are these writings without

numerous individual peculiarities, as is only to be expected in the case of the products, such as these are, of an intense religious enthusiasm. However, we cannot feel warranted in specifying the particular circle from which any one of those writings may be supposed to have emanated. The *Essenes* above all have been thought of in this connection.¹² But what points of contact there are, are far too slender to admit of our speaking even of one of the writings in question as an Essenian product. The most we can say is, that they are not the product of the school, but of a free religious individuality.

1. *The Book of Daniel.*

The oldest and most original of the kind of writings now under consideration—and the one that at the same time served as a model for those of a later date—is the canonical Book of Daniel. The unknown author of this apocalypse originated with creative energy those modes of representation of which the subsequent authors of similar works knew how to avail themselves. The book is the *direct product of the Maccabæan struggles*, in the very heart of which it came into existence. With the conflict actually raging around him, the author aims at encouraging and comforting his co-religionists by assuring them of speedy deliverance.

The book is divided into two parts. *The first part (i.–vi.) contains a series of hortatory narratives; the second (vii.–xii.) a series of prophetic visions.* Chap. i. rehearses how young Daniel and his three companions were brought up at the court of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon. We are told how, in order to avoid defiling themselves by partaking of Gentile food, the four young men refused to eat of the meat provided for them by the king, and preferred pulse and water instead.

¹² So Hilgenfeld in his book entitled *Die jüdische Apokalyptik* (1857), p. 253 sqq.; and, to a certain extent, also Lucius, *Der Essenismus* (1881), p. 109 sqq.

Notwithstanding this, as we further learn, they seemed to thrive better than the other young men who partook of the royal fare. The hortatory object of this narrative is obvious at a glance. In chap. ii. Nebuchadnezzar the king dreams a dream, and calls upon the magi not only to interpret it, but also to tell him what the dream itself was. Not one however of the magi of the country is found able to do this. Daniel alone shows himself capable of performing such a feat, and for this he is abundantly rewarded by the king, and appointed to the office of chief of all the magi of Babylon. In the course of the interpretation of the dream it is intimated that the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar would be succeeded by yet three other kingdoms, the last of which (the Greek one) would be "split up" (into that of the Ptolemies on the one hand, and that of the Seleucidae on the other) and crushed to pieces by the hand of God. In chap. iii. Nebuchadnezzar causes a golden image to be set up and orders it to be worshipped. For refusing to comply with this order Daniel's three companions are cast into a fiery furnace, but when it is found that they were not in the least injured by the flames, Nebuchadnezzar sees his own folly and promotes the three young men to positions of high distinction. In chap. iv. Nebuchadnezzar publishes an edict in which he confesses how, as a punishment for his impious presumption, he was smitten with insanity; and how, after he had duly given God the glory, he is restored once more to his former greatness. In chap. v. Belshazzar king of Babylon and son of Nebuchadnezzar makes a great feast, at which the vessels which his father had taken from the temple at Jerusalem are made use of as drinking-cups. To punish Belshazzar for this he loses both his kingdom and his life together that very night. In chap. vi. Darius king of the Medes, and the conqueror and successor of Belshazzar, in order to punish Daniel for praying to his own God in defiance of the king's prohibition, causes him to be cast into a den of lions, where however he does not sustain the slightest injury. The result of this is that

Darius comes to see his own folly, and issues a decree to the effect that Daniel's God is to be worshipped throughout the whole kingdom. It is no less obvious that a hortatory purpose pervades the last four of those narratives (iii.-vi.) as well, while, at the same time, the contemporary historical background is also plainly discernible. By the three kings we are in every instance to understand Antiochus Epiphanes as being the person meant, who, with impious arrogance, assumed such lofty airs (iv.), who carried off the sacred vessels from the temple at Jerusalem (v.), who forbade the Jews to worship their own God (vi.), and commanded them to pay divine honour to the gods of the Gentiles (iii.). We are shown how, as a judgment for his misdeeds, he is given over to destruction, and how, on the other hand, the Jews whom he persecuted are miraculously delivered. While therefore all those narratives are meant to stimulate to unflinching steadfastness the faithful people whom Antiochus was persecuting, we are introduced in the *second part* of the book (vii.-xii.) to a series of visions in which, from the standpoint of the Chaldaean period, the future development of the events of the world is foretold. The whole of the visions agree in this, that the monarchy which they foretell as being the last is the Greek one, which ultimately resolves itself into the godless rule of Antiochus Epiphanes, who, though not mentioned by name, is plainly enough indicated. We have above all in the last vision (from x. to xii.) a prediction of a highly detailed character, in which are foretold the history of the kingdoms of the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae respectively (for it is these that are meant by the kingdom of the south and the kingdom of the north), and their manifold relations to one another. Here the most remarkable thing is that the prediction becomes more and more minute and detailed the nearer it approaches to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Precisely the history of this monarch is here related with the utmost minuteness, without his name being once mentioned (xi. 21 sqq.). It is still the suppression of the Jewish worship,

the desecration of the temple, and the erection of the heathen altar for sacrifice, as well as the commencement of the Maccabaeen insurrection (xi. 32–35), that are predicted. But at this point the predictions suddenly stop, and the author now cherishes the expectation that, immediately after the struggles connected with the rising in question, the consummation will come and the kingdom of God begin to appear. Nor is it merely in the eleventh chapter that the predictions stop at this period, but in no other part of the book does the horizon of the author ever stretch beyond it, not even in the visions of the four monarchies (ii. and vii.). For the fourth is not the Roman Empire, but the Greek monarchy, as any one who candidly considers the matter will readily admit (the first being the Babylonian, the second that of the Medes, the third the Persian, and the fourth the Greek). In presence of these facts it is admitted by all the expositors of the present day—by all, that is, who are not hampered by dogmatic predilections—that our book was composed at the time of the Maccabaeen rising, or, to speak more precisely, between 167 and 165 B.C., that is to say before the re-consecrating of the temple, for as yet this latter event lies beyond the horizon of the author. It is only as viewed in the light of this period that the book can be said to have either sense or meaning. From beginning to end it is framed with the view of exercising a practical influence precisely in such a time as this. With its various narratives and revelations it seeks, on the one hand, to encourage the hosts of faithful Israelites to maintain a steadfast adherence to the law, and, on the other, to console them with the certain prospect of immediate deliverance. It is even at this very moment—such is the author's thought—when the distress is at its height, that the deliverance is also nearest at hand. The days of the Gentile monarchies are drawing to a close. The last and, at the same time, the most godless and criminal of them all, is on the point of being annihilated through the impending miraculous breaking in on the part of God upon the current of the

world's history, whereupon the sovereignty of the world will be committed to the "saints of the Most High," the faithful Israelites. They will inherit the kingdom and possess it for ever and ever. That is what those who are just now so sorely oppressed and persecuted are to bear in mind for their comfort and encouragement.

The book was composed partly in Hebrew and partly in Aramaic (Chaldee), the Aramaic portion being that extending from ii. 4 to vii. 28. And so from this we can see that it was just then that the Aramaic came to be the prevailing dialect of Palestine, while the Hebrew fell more and more into desuetude. In the course of two centuries after this, viz. in the time of Jesus Christ, we find that the process, which at this point is thus beginning, has been already fully completed (see Div. ii. vol. i. p. 9).

The high *estimation* in which from the first this book was held by believing Israelites is best shown by the fact that it always continued to *retain its place in the canon*. Even that somewhat older work, the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, was ultimately excluded from the Hebrew canon, and that, although in point of form and contents it approximates more closely to the early Hebrew literature than the Book of Daniel. Obviously the reason of both those facts is this, that the work of Jesus the son of Sirach was published under the author's real name, whereas the Book of Daniel appeared under the name of one of the older authorities. It is in fact the only literary product of its time that retained a place in the canon, with the exception of a number of psalms which happened to have been previously embodied in the Psalter. We already find evidence of *acquaintance with our book* in the oldest of the Sibyls (*Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 396-400, only a few decades later than Daniel); further in 1 Macc. ii. 59, 60, and Baruch i. 15-18.

The *exegetical and critical literature* of the Book of Daniel is enumerated in De Wette-Schrader's *Einleitung in die kanon. und apokr. Bücher des A. T.* (1869), p. 485 sq. Kleinert, *Abriss der Einleitung zum A. T.* (1878), pp. 59-61. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), § 464. Graf, art. "Daniel," in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* i. 564.

Perhaps we may be allowed in passing to offer here a small contribution toward the exposition of chap. ix. 24-27. In that passage the author endeavours to explain the seventy years of Jeremiah (Jer. xxv. 11, 12), by taking them to mean seventy *weeks of years* (70×7). And this number again he proceeds to break up into $7 + 62 + 1$. Then, as the context makes it well-nigh impossible to doubt, he reckons the first seven weeks of years (therefore 49 years) as the period that would elapse between the destruc-

tion of Jerusalem and the accession of Cyrus, which pretty nearly coincides with the actual number of years embraced in that period (588-537 B.C.). The subsequent sixty-two weeks of years he reckons, and that with rather more nicety than before, as being the period extending from the time of Cyrus to his (the author's) own day: till "an anointed one shall be cut off," by which we have probably to understand the murder of the high priest Onias III. in the year 171. But the number of years between 537 and 171 is only 366, whereas 62 weeks of years would be equal to 434. Consequently the author has miscalculated to the extent of 70 years. Some have supposed that this is impossible, and have therefore tried in various ways to evade the only interpretation of which the context will permit. But that such an error as this is actually possible is proved most conclusively by the circumstance that Josephus, for example, likewise falls into an error of a similar kind, as may be seen from the three following passages: (1) *Bell. Jud.* vi. 4. 8, where he gives 639 as the number of years that elapsed between the second year of Cyrus's reign till the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus (70 A.D.). In that case the second year of Cyrus's reign would have to be the year 569 B.C. (2) *Antt.* xx. 10, where he makes out that there was a period of 414 years between the return from the captivity (in the first year of Cyrus's reign) and the time of Antiochus V. Eupator (164-162). (3) *Antt.* xiii. 11. 1, where he calculates that 481 years elapsed between the return from the captivity (in the first year of the reign of Cyrus) and the time of Aristobulus (105-104). Consequently according to (1) the accession of Cyrus must have taken place in the year 570 B.C., according to (2) somewhere about 578 B.C., and according to (3) in 586 B.C., whereas in point of fact it took place in 537 B.C. *Josephus therefore has miscalculated to the extent of from forty to fifty years too many.* A somewhat nearer approach to the numbers of Daniel is made by the Jewish Hellenist Demetrius, who reckons that 573 years elapsed between the carrying away of the ten tribes into captivity and the time of Ptolemy IV. (222 B.C.), and so, *precisely like Daniel, putting it at some seventy years too many* (see the passage as given in Clement of Alexand. *Strom.* i. 21. 141; for more about Demetrius, see § 33 below). Therefore, in estimating the length of the period in question at some seventy years too much, Daniel is obviously following some current view on the matter. Just at the time now under consideration there was as yet an absence of the necessary means for determining the correct chronology. In Daniel's case, however, the error is all the less to be wondered at, that his estimating the length of the period referred to at sixty-two year weeks was simply a consequence of his interpretation of Jeremiah's prophecy.

2. *The Book of Enoch.*

Enoch (in common with *Elijah*) occupies this singular position among the Old Testament men of God, that when removed from the earth he was carried directly to heaven.

A man of this stamp could not but appear peculiarly well fitted to serve as a medium through which to communicate to the world revelations regarding the divine mysteries, seeing that he had even been deemed worthy of immediate intercourse with God. Accordingly at a somewhat early period, probably as far back as the second century before Christ, an apocalyptic writing appeared purporting to have been composed by Enoch, which work was subsequently issued in an enlarged and revised form. This Book of Enoch was already known to the author of the Book of "Jubilees" and of the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," and was afterwards a great favourite in the Christian Church. As is well known, it is quoted in the Epistle of Jude (14, 15), while many of the Fathers use it without hesitation as the genuine production of Enoch, and as containing authentic divine revelations, although it has never been officially recognised by the Church as canonical. We still find the Byzantine chronicler, George Syncellus (about 800 A.D.), quoting two long passages from it (Syncell. *Chron.* ed. Dindorf, i. 20-23 and 42-47). But after that the book disappeared, and was looked upon as lost till, in the course of last century, the discovery was made that an *Ethiopic version of it was still extant* in the Abyssinian Church. In the year 1773, Bruce the English traveller brought three manuscripts of it to Europe. But it was not till the year 1821 that the whole work was given to the world through the English translation of Laurence. A German translation was issued by Hoffmann which, from chap. i. to lv. (1833), was based upon the English version of Laurence, and from chap. lvi. to the end (1838) on the Ethiopic version collated with a new manuscript. The Ethiopic text was published first by Laurence in 1838, and subsequently by Dillmann in 1851, after having collated it with five manuscripts. Dillmann likewise issued (1853) a new German translation, in which there were material emendations, and on which all disquisitions connected with this book have been based ever since. It seemed as though there were reason to hope that

more light would be thrown upon this book when a small fragment of it in Greek (extending from ver. 42 to ver. 49 of chap. lxxxix.), taken from a *Codex Vaticanus* (cod. gr. 1809), written in tachygraphic characters, was published in facsimile by Mai (*Patrum Nova Biblioth.* vol. ii.), and deciphered by Gildmeister (*Zeitschr. der DMG.* 1855, pp. 621-624). For, from what was stated by Mai, one was led to suppose that there was still far more in the codex than had yet been published. But, alas! a fresh examination by Gebhardt revealed the fact that the deciphered fragment was all of the Book of Enoch that it contained (Merx' *Archiv*, vol. ii. p. 243).

But in order to be able to form something like a clear idea of the origin and character of this remarkable book, it will be necessary to present to the reader a brief outline of its contents.

Chap. i. 1: Title. Enoch's benediction on the elect and the righteous. Chaps. i.-v.: Introduction. Enoch rehearses the fact that he saw a vision in heaven, which was shown him by the angels who communicated to him the history of all the future generations of men, telling him that the wicked would be sentenced to everlasting damnation, while the righteous would obtain eternal life. Chaps. vi.-xi. contain an account of the fall of the angels, based upon the sixth chapter of Genesis, though in a much more elaborate form. God ordains the kind of punishment to which the fallen angels are to be condemned, and appoints the mode in which the earth is to be purged of their evil-doing and wickedness. The angels are entrusted with the task of executing both those behests. In chaps. xii.-xvi. Enoch, who mingles among the angels in heaven, is commissioned by these latter to betake himself to the earth for the purpose of announcing to the fallen angels the impending judgment (here Enoch resumes the use of the first person). When he has fulfilled his commission the fallen angels prevail upon him to intercede with God in their behalf. But God refuses to entertain the intercession of Enoch, who in a new and imposing vision receives a fresh

commission to go and announce once more their approaching destruction. In xvii.-xxxvi. Enoch relates (in the first person) how he was carried over mountains, water and rivers, and shown everywhere the secret divine origin of all the objects and operations of nature. He also tells how he was shown the ends of the earth, and the place to which the evil angels were banished; and the abode of departed spirits, of the just as well as the unjust; and the tree of life which is in store for the elect righteous; and the place of punishment for the condemned; and the tree of knowledge of which Adam and Eve had eaten. Chaps. xxxvii. to lxxi. record "the second vision of wisdom which Enoch the son of Jared saw," consisting of *three allegories*. Chaps. xxxviii. to xlv. contain the first allegory. Enoch sees in a vision the dwellings of the righteous and the resting-places of the saints. He also sees the myriads upon myriads who stand before the majesty of the Lord of spirits, and the four archangels Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel. He is further permitted to look upon the mysteries of heaven, to see the places where the winds are kept, and the receptacles for the sun and moon, and lastly to behold the lightning and the stars of heaven, all of which have their own special names, and which names they respectively answer to. Chaps. xlv. to lvii. contain the second allegory. Enoch is favoured with information regarding the "Chosen One," the "Son of man," *i.e.* regarding the Messiah, His nature and mission, how He is to judge the world and establish His kingdom. Chaps. lviii. to lxix. contain the third allegory, treating of the blessedness of the righteous and the elect; of the mysteries of the thunder and lightning; of the day on which the Chosen One, the Son of man, is to sit in judgment upon the world. Here several portions are inserted which interrupt the continuity and plainly show that they are interpolations by another hand. Chaps. lxx.-lxxi. contain the conclusion of the allegories. In chaps. lxxii.-lxxxii. we have "the book concerning the revolutions of the lights of heaven," or *the astronomical book*. Here Enoch favours us with all

sorts of astronomical information which he himself had obtained from the angel Uriel. Chaps. lxxxiii. to xc. contain *two visions*. (a) In lxxxiii. to lxxxiv. Enoch sees in a dreadful vision the destruction (by the flood) which is awaiting the sinful world, and prays God not to annihilate the whole human family. (b) In lxxxv. to xc. we have the vision of the cattle, sheep, wild beasts and shepherds; under the symbolism of which the whole history of Israel is predicted down to the commencement of the Messianic era. As this historical vision is the only part of the book which enables us with anything like approximate certainty to determine the date of its composition, we will devote more special attention to its contents at a subsequent stage. In chap. xci. we have Enoch's exhortation to his children to lead a righteous life (by way of conclusion to what goes before). Chap. xcii. forms the introduction to the next section. In xciii. and xciv. 12-17, Enoch enlightens us "out of the books" regarding the *world-weeks*. In the first week Enoch lives, in the second Noah, in the third Abraham, in the fourth Moses, in the fifth the temple is built, at the end of the sixth it is destroyed again, in the seventh an apostate generation arises, and at the end of those weeks the righteous are instructed in the mysteries of heaven; in the eighth righteousness receives a sword, and sinners are given into the hands of the righteous, and a house is built for the great King; in the ninth the judgment is revealed; in the tenth and in the seventh part of it the final judgment will take place. Chaps. xciv. to cv. contain woes upon the wicked and the ungodly, the announcement of their certain destruction, and an exhortation to cherish joyful expectations addressed to the righteous (very diffuse and full of mere repetitions). In chaps. cvi. and cvii. we have a narrative of the birth of Noah and what took place at it. The wonderful appearance of this personage gives Enoch occasion to predict the flood. Chap. cviii. contains "a further writing by Enoch," in which he tells hows he had got certain information from an angel regarding the fire of hell to which the souls of the

wicked and the blaspheming are to be consigned, as well as regarding the blessings that are in store for the humble and the righteous.

As may be seen from this outline of its contents, this book purports to be a series of revelations with which Enoch was favoured in the course of his peregrinations through heaven and earth, and of his sojourn among the heavenly spirits. These revelations he committed to writing for the benefit of mankind and transmitted them to posterity. The contents are of an extremely varied character. They embrace the laws of nature no less than the organization and history of the kingdom of God. To impart information regarding the whole of those matters is the purpose and object of this mysterious book. The work furnishes but few data that can be turned to account in the way of enabling us to make out the circumstances under which it was composed. Consequently the views that have been expressed relative to this are of a widely divergent order. Still a certain consensus of opinion has grown up with regard to at least a few leading points. In the first place we may say that the view of J. Chr. K. von Hofmann, Weisse, and Philippi, to the effect that the *entire* book is the work of a *Christian* author (Hofmann holding that the interpolations are but of a trifling character) is confined pretty much to those writers themselves.¹⁸ In the case of the whole three of them the entertaining of such a view is essentially due to dogmatic reasons, while, in the case of Hofmann and Philippi in particular, it is to be attributed to a desire to get rid of the fact that our book is quoted in the Epistle of Jude (for they would have us believe that conversely it was that passage in the Book of Jude that first suggested the writing of the book now under consideration). But speaking generally, it may be affirmed that there is scarcely any modern scholar who holds that the whole work was composed by one and the same author. Even Dillmann,

¹⁸ Lücke, who at one time (1st ed.) was also disposed to favour this view, decidedly abandoned it afterwards.

who in his translation and exposition still continued to assume a substantial unity of authorship (the interpolations being only trifling, although tolerably numerous), has—in spite of Wittichen's almost entire concurrence in it—long ago abandoned this view. He is now at one with almost all the critics in holding that the book consists of several pieces, and all of them entirely different from one another. On this assumption it is almost universally admitted that the *so-called* "*allegories*," chaps. xxxvii.–lxxi., are above all to be ascribed to a separate author (so for example Krieger, Lücke, 2nd ed., Ewald, Dillmann latterly, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, Langen, Sieffert, Reuss, Volkmar). Likewise in the case of the other leading sections of the book (i.–xxxvi. and lxxii.–cviii.), interpolations more or less numerous are almost universally acknowledged to exist, although there is considerable diversity of opinion as to where in each instance they begin and end. Again, there is, comparatively speaking, a high degree of unanimity with regard to the date of the composition of each of those leading sections, above all, of the one containing the visions (lxxxiii.–xc.). Volkmar alone has found his predilection for the time of Barcocheba too much for him in this instance as well, preferring, as he does, to regard the portions in question as having been written by one of Akiba's disciples. All the others are agreed in holding that they belong to the second century B.C., either limiting the date to the earlier years of the Maccabaeian period (so Krieger, Lücke, 2nd ed., Langen), or finding it further on, viz. in the days of John Hyrcanus (so Ewald, Dillmann, Köstlin, Sieffert, Reuss, likewise Wittichen), or even so late as the time of Alexander Jannaeus (so Hilgenfeld). But it is with respect to that section which, as regards its contents, is the most important of any, viz. the allegories, chaps. xxxvi.–lxxi., that opinion fluctuates most of all. Here Hilgenfeld and Volkmar agree with Hofmann, Weisse, and Philippi thus far, that in common with these latter they ascribe the section in question to a Christian author (Hilgenfeld to a Gnostic writer). All other critics refer it to some

pre-Christian period, Langen to the earlier days of the Maccabæan age in common with the rest of the book, Ewald to somewhere about 144 B.C., Köstlin, Sieffert, and Dillmann (Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 351 sq.) to some date previous to 64 B.C., Krieger and Lücke to the early part of Herod's reign, while Reuss refrains from suggesting any date at all.

Such unanimity as has thus far been secured may serve at the same time to give us an idea how far we can here hope to obtain results of a trustworthy character. If there is one thing more certain than another it is this, that the *book is not all the production of one and the same author*. Not only is the section containing the allegories, chaps. xxxvii.–lxxi., undoubtedly a perfectly independent portion of the book, but all the rest of the work is composed of very heterogeneous elements, and obviously interspersed with a great number of longer or shorter interpolations. Confining ourselves to the leading portions of the work, the following groups may be distinguished:—

1. The *original writing*, i.e. the leading portion consisting of i.–xxxvi., lxxii.–cv., but with the restriction just referred to. The only clue we get to the date of its composition is that furnished by the *historical vision* in chaps. lxxxv.–xc. Here we have a representation of the entire history of the theocracy from Adam down to the author's own day, and that under the symbolism of cattle and sheep. In a vision presented to him in a dream, Enoch saw how a white ox (Adam) once sprung out of the earth; and then a white cow (Eve); and along with this latter yet other cattle, a black ox (Cain) and a red one (Abel). The black ox gored the red one, which thereupon vanished from the earth. But the black ox begat many other black cattle. Thereupon the cow just referred to (Eve) gave birth to a white ox (Seth), from which sprung a great many other white cattle. But stars (angels) fell from heaven, and after having had intercourse with the cows of the black cattle (the daughters of Cain), they begat elephants, camels, and asses (the giants). And so in this way the history is

proceeded with, the theocratic line being always represented by the white cattle. From Jacob onwards white sheep are substituted for the white cattle. The symbolic character of the representation is patent all through, while it presents hardly any difficulty in the way of interpretation till we come to the point where the sheep are attacked by wild animals, *i.e.* till the hostile powers of Assyria and Babylon come upon the stage. For in lxxxix. 55 it is narrated how the Lord of the sheep delivered them into the hand of the lions and tigers and wolves and jackals, and into the hand of the foxes, and all manner of wild beasts; and how the wild beasts began to tear the sheep to pieces. And the Lord forsook their house (Jerusalem) and their tower (the temple), lxxxix. 56, *i.e.* He withdrew His gracious presence from them (for there is no question of the destruction of these till a much later stage). And He appointed *seventy shepherds* to feed the sheep, and charged them to allow as many to be torn to pieces by the wild beasts as He would order them, but not more (lxxxix. 59, 60). And he summoned "another" and commanded him to write down the number of sheep destroyed by the shepherds (lxxxix. 61–64). And the shepherds fed them "each his time," and delivered the sheep into the hand of the lions and tigers. And these latter burnt down that tower (the temple) and destroyed that house (Jerusalem, lxxxix. 65, 66). And the shepherds delivered to the wild beasts far more sheep than they had been ordered to do (lxxxix. 68–71). And when the shepherds had fed the flock *twelve* hours, three of those sheep came back and began to rebuild the house (Jerusalem) and the tower (the temple), chap. lxxxix. 72, 73. But the sheep were so blinded as to mingle with the beasts of the field; and the shepherds did not rescue them from the hand of the beasts (lxxxix. 74, 75). But when *five-and-thirty*¹⁴ shepherds had fed them, all the

¹⁴ Dillmann reads thirty-six, which is not supported by manuscript authority. The manuscripts read thirty-seven. But, from what follows, there can hardly be a doubt that thirty-five is the correct reading.

fowls of the air, the eagles, the hawks, the kites and the ravens came and began to prey upon those sheep and to peck out their eyes and to devour their flesh (xc. 1, 2). And again when *three-and-twenty* shepherds had tended the flock and *eight-and-fifty* times in all were completed (xc. 5), then little lambs were born of the white sheep, and they began to cry to the sheep; but these pay no heed to them (xc. 6, 7). And the ravens swooped down upon the lambs and seized one of them, and tore and devoured the sheep, till horns grew upon the lambs, and, above all, a large horn shot out to which all the young ones betake themselves (xc. 8–10). And the eagles and the hawks and the kites still continue to tear the sheep to pieces. And the ravens sought to break to pieces the horn of that young sheep and struggled with it; and it strove with them. And the Lord came to the help of that young one; and all the beasts flee and fall before him (xc. 11–15). Here the narrative breaks off. For what follows seems for the author to lie in the future. It is only further remarked that *the twelve last shepherds* had destroyed more than those who had preceded them (xc. 17).

In their endeavours to interpret this narrative, so clear and perspicuous in all the leading points, the expositors seem almost to have vied with each other in trying who would misunderstand it most. Strangely enough, all the earlier expositors down to Lücke inclusive have taken the first thirty-seven shepherds to mean the native kings of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah! It is true no doubt that in the present day all are agreed that the seventy shepherds are intended to represent the period during which Israel was subjected to the sway of the Gentile powers. But it is a strange misapprehension, into which almost all the expositors have been betrayed, when they suppose that the seventy shepherds are intended to represent a corresponding number of Gentile rulers. The whole narrative leaves no room whatever to doubt, *that the shepherds are rather to be understood as angels* who are entrusted with the duty of seeing that only as many

of the sheep are torn to pieces as God intends and no more. So far as I am aware, up till the publication of the first edition of the present work, Von Hofmann was the only writer who recognised this (*Schriftbeweis*, i. 422).¹⁵ It is, as it is impossible to doubt, the wild beasts and the birds of prey that represent the Gentile rulers. Consequently the shepherds must have some other meaning altogether. But they certainly cannot be taken as representing human beings, for throughout the entire vision these latter are, without exception, represented under the symbolism of animals, whereas the angels appear even in chap. lxxxvii. under that of men. And that the shepherds are as matter of fact intended to represent angels is still further confirmed by what follows: (1) Before they commence to tend the flock they *all* appear before God *at one and the same time*, and from Him receive their commission to feed the flock one after the other (lxxxix. 59). How could this apply to Gentile rulers? Or are we to think of them as in a pre-existent state? (2) At the judgment they are classed along with the fallen angels (xc. 20 sqq.). (3) The angel that is summoned to write down the number of sheep that are destroyed is in lxxxix. 61 briefly spoken of as “another,” which would surely justify us in assuming that the shepherds mentioned immediately before belong to precisely the same category as this “other.” (4) Nor can the shepherds be identified with the Gentile rulers for this further reason, that according to lxxxix. 75 they are also entrusted with the duty of protecting the sheep from the wild beasts. Consequently they are evidently an impartial power placed over the sheep and the wild beasts alike, or they are meant to be so at least.¹⁶ The thought in the author’s mind then is this, that from the moment that in

¹⁵ Since then this view has been endorsed by Kesselring (*Lit. Centralbl.* 1874, p. 133), Drummond (*The Jewish Messiah*, p. 40 sqq.) and Wieseler (*Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch.* 1882, p. 186).

¹⁶ Even in the later Jewish Haggadah we meet with the idea that seventy angels were set over the Gentile world, that is to say one over each

accordance with the divine purpose Israel was assailed and subjugated by the Gentile powers, God appointed angels whose duty it was to see that these powers executed upon Israel the judgment with which He intended them to be visited ; and not only so, but also to see that they did not oppress and persecute Israel unduly. But the watchers neglect their duty ; they allow the wild beasts to destroy a greater number than they ought to have done, and, as is predicted toward the conclusion, they are for this to be cast into hell-fire along with the fallen angels.

It would lead to too great a digression were we to do more in the way of refuting the misapprehensions here in question. We must content ourselves with briefly stating what—following Dillmann and Ewald above all—we conceive to be the correct interpretation. The numbers in the text serve to show that the author divides the time of the duration of the Gentile supremacy into *four periods* arranged thus : 12 + 23 + 23 + 12, which are simply intended to denote in a general way two shorter periods (at the beginning) and two longer ones (in the middle). For every calculation pretending to chronological exactness must be radically erroneous, whether, with Hilgenfeld, we take year-weeks or, with Volkmar, take decades as our basis. Nor can there be any doubt as to where the different periods are intended to begin and end. The *first* begins with the time when the Gentile powers (consequently that of Assyria in the first instance) began to turn against Israel, and extends to the time of the return of the exiles in the reign of Cyrus, the only difficulty here being as to who are meant by the three returning sheep (lxxxix. 72). Probably the author here alludes to Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, the less prominent colleague of Zerubbabel, viz. Joshua, being left out of account. The *second* period extends of the seventy Gentile nations. See *Targum of Jonathan* on Deut. xxxii. 8. *Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer*, chap. xxiv. Wagenseil's note on *Sota* vii. 5 (in Surenhusius's *Mishna*, iii. 263 sq.). Schegg, *Evangelium nach Lukas übers. und erklärt*, ii. 69. Also the expositors generally on Luke x. 1.

from Cyrus to Alexander the Great. For the substitution of the birds of prey for the wild beasts (xc. 2) plainly marks the transition from the Persians to the Greeks. The *third* extends from Alexander the Great to Antiochus Epiphanes. Nothing but stubborn prejudice can prevent any one from seeing that, by the symbolism of the lambs (xc. 6), the Maccabees are to be understood. Lastly, the *fourth* period extends from the commencement of the Maccabæan age on to the author's own day. That, everything considered, this latter coincides with the time of the Hasmonæan princes it is impossible to doubt. And it is very likely that, by the great horn which is mentioned last, it is John Hyrcanus that is referred to. Only we feel bound to agree with Gebhardt, who, owing to the uncertain character of the Ethiopic text, warns us against being too detailed in our interpretation. But (seeing that from the beginning of the Maccabæan age onwards the times of twelve shepherds had elapsed) this may be regarded as certain, *that the author wrote some time in the last third of the second century B.C.* If we compare the $12 + 23 + 23 + 12$ times, that are put down to represent the four periods, with the actual duration of those periods, we will find that, for the eye of the author looking backwards, the length of the time is foreshortened. He represents the third period (333–175 B.C.) as being of precisely the same length as the second, whereas in point of fact this latter was considerably longer (537–333 B.C.). And for his eye the first period dwindles down still more. All this is exactly what we might expect in the case of one who is looking back upon the events of the past.

If we were to be allowed to assume that the author of the historical vision is, in the main, the author of chaps. i.–xxxvi., lxxii.–cv. as well, then the date of the composition of the whole of those sections would thereby be determined at the same time.

2. *The allegories*, chaps. xxxvii.–lxxi. (with the exception of the Noachian portions). Even on a hasty perusal one

cannot fail to notice that the allegories form one distinct whole, and that they are different from the remaining portions of the book. In fact there cannot be the slightest doubt but that they are the production of a different author. The use of the names of God, the angelology, the eschatology, and the doctrine of the Messiah differ essentially from those of the rest of the book (comp. especially Köstlin, pp. 265–268). And as little can there be any room to doubt that they are of a *later date* than the original work. For the favourite notion of Ewald, that they rank first in point of time, has been sufficiently refuted by Köstlin (pp. 269–273). Among the peculiarities of the allegories we notice this in particular, that a decided prominence is given in them to the Messianic hope and the person of the Messiah, whereas, in the other parts of the book, those are matters that are touched on once or twice at the most. This again is connected with a further peculiarity to which Köstlin in particular has directed attention, namely, that here, instead of its being the wicked and the ungodly in general who appear in contrast to the pious, as is the case in the rest of the book, it is rather the Gentile rulers, the kings and the powerful ones of the earth (chaps. xxxviii. 4, 5, xlvi. 7, 8, xlviii. 8–10, liii. 5, liv. 2, lv. 4, lxii. 1, 3, 6, 9–11, lxiii. 1–12). This circumstance serves to explain why it is that precisely in these allegories such decided prominence is given to the Messianic hope. But when, it may now be asked, were they composed? The only passage which furnishes any clue to the date is chap. lvi., where it is predicted that, in the closing period, the Parthians and Medes would come from the east and invade the Holy Land, but that they would encounter obstacles at the holy city, when they would turn upon and destroy each other (lvi. 5–7). When Köstlin would have us infer from this passage that the writing here in question must have been composed previous to the year 64 B.C., as otherwise we should have expected that the Romans would have been mentioned as well, we may reply that such an expectation is absolutely

groundless and unwarrantable. It would be much nearer the truth to conclude, with Lücke, that this passage presupposes what had already taken place, viz. the Parthian invasion of Palestine (40–38 B.C.), the recollection of which would have some influence in shaping the author's eschatological hopes, so that, according to this, the allegories would be composed *at the very soonest in the time of Herod*. On the other hand, the prediction to the effect that the Parthian power would collapse outside the walls of Jerusalem, presupposes that the city was still standing, as otherwise it would surely have been necessary first of all to predict its restoration. But the main question now is this, are the allegories of pre- or of post-Christian origin? An answer to this question is all the more desirable, that it is precisely in these that we find so many points of contact with the Christology and eschatology of the Gospels. But unfortunately it is extremely difficult to arrive at any positive decision. However, this much at least ought to be admitted, that the view of the Messiah presented in the part of the book at present under consideration is perfectly explicable on Jewish grounds, and that, to account for such view, it is not necessary to assume that it was due to Christian influences. Nothing of a specifically Christian character is to be met with in any part of this section. But, supposing the reverse to have been the case, it is, to say the least of it, quite incredible that a Jew would have been likely to have borrowed it, and so there would be nothing for it but to pronounce at once in favour of a *Christian* origin. And this is what has actually been done by all those who cannot see their way to admit the pre-Christian origin of the writing (Hofmann, Weisse, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Philippi). But no sooner is such a view seriously entertained than the difficulties begin to accumulate. An anonymous Christian author would scarcely have been so reserved as to avoid making any allusion to the historical personality of Jesus. Surely if the writer had any object in view at all it would be to win converts to the faith. But how could he hope to accomplish

this object, if he always spoke merely of the coming of the Messiah in glory, merely of "the Chosen One" as the Judge of the world, without making the slightest reference to the fact that, in the first place, He would have to appear in His estate of humiliation? Surely any one who candidly weighs the arguments on the one side and on the other must feel constrained to admit that the pre-Christian origin is decidedly more probable than the Christian one. Further, the objection based upon the circumstance that, according to Matt. xvi. 13-16, John xii. 34, the expression "Son of man" was not as yet a current designation for the Messiah in the time of Christ, whereas it is of frequent occurrence in this sense in the allegories, is without force. For we are by no means at liberty to infer from those passages that the expression "Son of man" was not at that time currently in use as a Messianic title. In the case of the passage in John this inference is based simply upon false exegesis (see, on the other hand, Meyer for example). The passage in Matthew again is disposed of by the circumstance that, in its original form as preserved in Mark viii. 27 = Luke ix. 18, the expression "Son of man" does not occur at all.

3. *The Noachian portions.* The investigations of Dillmann, Ewald, and Köstlin have already sufficiently proved that the passages liv. 7-lv. 2, lx. 65-lxix. 25 break the sequence, and were only inserted among the allegories at a later period. And if further proof were needed, we have it in the fact that in chap. lxviii. 1, "The Book of the Allegories of Enoch" is expressly quoted. Those portions have been called Noachian, partly because they treat of Noah and his time, and partly because they purport to have been written by him. Probably chaps. cvi., cvii. should also be included among them. Chap. cviii. is an independent addition inserted at a later period. It is utterly impossible to say at what dates those various interpolations were made.

The whole Book of Enoch, which was gradually put together in the way we have just stated, undoubtedly owes

its origin to Palestine (comp. Dillmann, *Einleitung*, p. 51). But as our present Ethiopic version is taken from the Greek, it becomes a question whether this latter was the original or whether it was in turn a translation from the Hebrew or Aramaic. Certainly the numerous Hebrew names of the angels point to this latter as probable, to say nothing of the fact that, in the Hasmonaeon age, Greek was hardly ever used for literary purposes. Consequently it has been almost universally assumed that the original was composed in Hebrew or Aramaic.¹⁷ The only exceptions are Volkmar (*Zeitschr. der DMG.* 1860, p. 131) and Philippi (p. 126), who feel compelled to adopt the view that Greek was the language of the original.

For the Enoch-legend generally, comp. (next to Gen. v. 18-24) Jesus the Son of Sirach xlv. 16, xlix. 14; Heb. xi. 5; Irenaeus, v. 5. 1; Tertullian, *De anima*, chap. 1.; Hippolyt. *De Christo et Antichristo*, chaps. xliii.-xlvi.; *Evang. Nicodemi* (= *Acta Pilati*), chap. xxv.; *Historia Josephi* (*apocr.*), chaps. xxx.-xxxii. Thilo, *Codex apocr. Nov. Test.* p. 756 sqq. Rud. Hofmann, *Das Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen*, p. 459 sqq. Winer, *Realwörterb.* art. "Henoch." Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. für Bibel und Talmud*, Part ii. art. "Henochsage." The Bible dictionaries generally. The expositors on Revelation xi. For a great number of earlier dissertations, consult Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 222 sq.

To an acquaintance with our book is perhaps to be traced so early a notice as that of a Jewish or Samaritan Hellenist (probably not Eupolemus, but some person unknown, see § xxxiii.) which has been transmitted to us by Alexander Polyhistor, and after him by Eusebius, to the effect that Enoch was the inventor of astrology (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 17. 8, ed. Gaisford: τοῦτον εὐρηκέναι πρῶτον τὴν ἀστρολογίαν). In the Book of Jubilees not only is our book largely drawn upon, but expressly mentioned (see Ewald's *Jahrbh. der bibl. Wissensch.* ii. 240 sq., iii. 18 sq., 90 sq. Rönseh, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, p. 403 sqq.). In the following nine passages in the *Test. XII. Patr.* express reference is made to Enoch's prophetic writings: Simeon v.; Levi x. 14, 16; Judah xviii.; Zebulon iii.; Dan v.; Naphtali iv.; Benjamin ix. Further, the mention of the ἐγγήγορες (watchers=angels) in Reuben v., Naphtali iii., may also be said to point to Enoch.

Christian testimonies: *Epist. of Jude*, 14: ἐπροφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τοῦτοις ἔβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ Ἐνώχ λέγων κ.τ.λ. *Epist. of Barnabas* iv.: τὸ τέλειον σκάνδαλον ἡγγικεν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται, ὡς Ἐνώχ λέγει. *Ibid.* xvi.: λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή (then follows a quotation from the Book of Enoch). Irenaeus

¹⁷ For the view that the original was in Hebrew, see in particular Hallévi, *Journral Asiatique*, 1867, April-May, pp. 352-395.

iv. 16. 2: Sed et Enoch sine circumcisione placens Deo, cum esset homo, Dei legatione ad angelos fungebatur et translatus est et conservatur usque nunc testis iusti iudicii Dei. Tertullian, *De cultu feminarum*, i. 3: Scio scripturam Enoch, quae hunc ordinem angelis dedit, non recipi a quibusdam, quia nec in armarium Judaicum admittitur. Opinor, non putaverunt illam ante cataclysmum editam post eum casum orbis omnium rerum abolitorem salvam esse potuisse. . . . Tertullian then goes on to point out how this was still quite possible, after which he proceeds as follows: Sed cum Enoch eadem scriptura etiam de domino praedicarit, a nobis quidem nihil omnino rejiciendum est, quod pertineat ad nos. Et legimus omnem scripturam aedificationi habilem divinitus inspirari. A Judaeis potest jam videri propterea rejecta, sicut et cetera fere quae Christum sonant. . . . Eo accedit, quod Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet. Comp. besides the whole of the introduction to chap. ii., the subject of which is taken from Enoch. Idem, *De cultu feminarum*, ii. 10: (iidem angeli) damnati a deo sunt, ut Enoch refert. Idem, *De idololatr.* iv.: Antecesserat Enoch praedicens, etc. Idem, *De idololatr.* xv.: Haec igitur ab initio praevidens spiritus sanctus (!) etiam ostia in superstitionem ventura praececinuit per antiquissimum propheten Enoch. Clemens Alex. *Eclogae prophet.* chap. ii. (Dindorf, iii. 456): “Εὐλογημένος εἶ ὁ βλέπων ἀβύσσους, καθήμενος ἐπὶ Χερουβίμ” ὁ Δανιὴλ λέγει ὁμοδοξῶν τῷ Ἐνώχ τῷ εἰρηκώτι “καὶ εἶδον τὰς ὕλας πάσας.” Idem, *Eclogae prophet.* chap. liii. (Dindorf, iii. 474): ἤδη δὲ καὶ Ἐνώχ φησιν τοὺς παραβάντας ἀγγέλους διδάξαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀστρονομίαν καὶ μαντικὴν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας τέχνας. Celsus, in Origen, *Contra Cels.* v. 52, endeavours to show that Christians would contradict themselves were they to maintain that Christ was the only ἀγγέλος sent down into the world by God. As evidence of this he quotes the following words: ἐλθεῖν γὰρ καὶ ἄλλους λέγουσι πολλάκις καὶ ὁμοῦ γε ἐξήκοντα ἢ ἐβδομήκοντα· οὗς δὴ γενέσθαι κακοὺς καὶ κολάζεσθαι δεσμοῖς ὑποβληθέντας ἐν γῇ· ὅθεν καὶ τὰς θερμὰς πηγὰς εἶναι τὰ ἐκείνων δάκρυα κ.τ.λ. In commenting on this passage Origen (*Contra Cels.* v. 54, 55) remarks that it is taken from the Book of Enoch. He thinks however that Celsus did not read it there himself, but heard it from somebody or other, for he does not mention the author's name. Origen, *Contra Cels.* v. 54: ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις οὐ πάνυ φέρεται ὡς θεῖα τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα τοῦ Ἐνώχ βιβλία (observe the plural). Idem, *De principiis*, i. 3. 3: Sed et in Enoch libro his similia describuntur. Idem, *De principiis*, iv. 35: Sed et in libro suo Enoch ita ait: “Ambulavi usque ad imperfectum” . . . scriptum namque est in eodem libello dicente Enoch: “Universas materias perspexi.” Idem, *In Numer. homil.* xxviii. 2 (de la Rue, ii. 384=Lommatzsch, x. 366): De quibus quidem nominibus plurima in libellis, qui appellantur Enoch, secreta continentur et arcana: sed quia libelli isti non videntur apud Hebraeos in auctoritate haberi, interim nunc ea, quae ibi nominantur, ad exemplum vocare differamus. Idem, *In Joannem*, vol. vi. chap. xxv. (de la Rue, iv. 142=Lommatzsch, i. 241): ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἐνώχ γέγραπται, εἰ τω φίλον παραδέχεσθαι ὡς ἄγιον τὸ βιβλίον. Anatolius in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* vii. 32. 19: Τοῦ δὲ τὸν πρῶτον παρ’ Ἑβραίοις μῆνα περὶ ἰσημερίαν εἶναι, παραστατικά καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ Ἐνώχ μαθήματα. Jerome, *De viris illustr.*

chap. iv.: Judas frater Jacobi parvam, quæ de septem catholicis est, epistolam reliquit. Et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in ea assumit testimonia a plerisque rejicitur, etc. Idem, *Comment. in Epist. ad Titum*, i. 12 (Vallarsi, vii. 1. 708): Qui autem putant totum librum debere sequi eum, qui libri parte usus sit, videntur mihi et apocryphum Enoch, de quo apostolus Judas in epistola sua testimonium posuit, inter ecclesiæ scripturas recipere. In the so-called stichometry of Nicephorus and in the *Synopsis Athanasii*, the Book of Enoch is classed with the Apocrypha (Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, pp. 121, 145). So also in the anonymous list of the canonical books which has been edited by Montfaucon, Cotelier, Hody, and Pitra respectively (see v. 7 below). *Constit. apostol.* vi. 16: καὶ ἐν ταῖς παλαιαῖς δὲ τινες συνέγραψαν βιβλία ἀπόκρυφα Μωσῆος καὶ Ἐνὼχ καὶ Ἀδὰμ Ἡσαίου τε καὶ Δαβὶδ καὶ Ἡλίας καὶ τῶν τριῶν πατριάρχων, φθοροποιὰ καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθρά. For yet other testimonia patrum, consult Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 160–223, ii. 55–61. Philippi, *Das Buch Henoch*, p. 102 sqq. Also the two large fragments from Syncellus in Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, pp. 82–86.

Editions of the Ethiopic text: Laurence, *Libri Enoch versio Aethiopica*, Oxoniae 1838. Dillmann, *Liber Henoch Aethiopice, ad quinque codicum fidem editus, cum variis lectionibus*, Lipsiae 1851.

Versions: (1) English ones: Laurence, *The Book of Enoch, an apocryphal production supposed to have been lost for ages, but discovered at the close of the last century in Abyssinia, now first translated from an Ethiopic MS. in the Bodleian Library*, Oxford 1821. Schodde, *The Book of Enoch, translated with Introduction and Notes*, Andover 1882. (2) German ones: Hoffmann (Andreas Gottlieb), *Das Buch Henoch in vollständiger Uebersetzung mit fortlaufendem Commentar, ausführlicher Einleitung und erläuternden Excursen*, 2 vols. Jena 1833–1838. Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch, übersetzt und erklärt*, Leipzig 1853.

Critical inquiries: Laurence in his English translation. Hoffmann (Andr. Gottl.), art. "Enoch," in Ersch and Gruber's *Encycl.* § 2, vol. v. (1829) pp. 399–409. Idem, in his German translation. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils* (also under the title, *Gesch. des Urchristenthums*, vol. i.–ii. 1838), i. 93–109. Wieseler, *Die 70 Wochen und die 63 Jahrwochen des Propheten Daniel*, 1839, p. 162 sqq. Krieger (Lützelberger), *Beiträge zur Kritik und Exegese*, Nürnberg 1845. Lücke, *Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes* (2nd ed. 1852), pp. 89–144; comp. 1171–1173. Hofmann (J. Chr. K.), "Ueber die Entstehungszeit des Buch Henoch" (*Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch.* vol. vi. 1852, pp. 87–91). Idem, *Schriftbeweis* (2nd ed.), i. 420–423. Idem, *Die heil. Schrift N. T.'s zusammenhängend untersucht*, vii. 2, p. 205 sqq. Dillmann in his German translation. Idem, in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. xii. 308–310. Idem, *Zeitschr. DMG.* 1861, pp. 126–131. Idem, in Schenkel's *Bibelles.* iii. (1871) pp. 10–13. Idem, in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. (1883) pp. 350–352. Ewald, "Abhandlung über des äthiopischen Buches Henókh Entstehung, Sinn und Zusammensetzung" (*Abhandlungen der königl. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen*, vol. vi. 1853–1855, Historico-philosoph. section, pp. 107–178. Also separate reprint). Idem, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, 3rd

ed. iv. 451 sqq. Weisse, *Die Evangelienfrage* (1856), pp. 214–224. Köstlin, "Ueber die Entstehung des Buchs Henoch" (*Theol. Jahrbücher* 1856, pp. 240–279, 370–386). Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik* (1857), pp. 91–184. Idem, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* vol. iii. 1860, pp. 319–334; iv. 1861, pp. 212–222; v. 1862, pp. 216–221; xv. 1872, pp. 584–587. Volkmar, "Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches Henoch nach dem äthiopischen Text" (*Zeitschr. der DMG.*, vol. xiv. 1860, pp. 87–134, 296). Idem, in *Der Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* vol. iv. 1861, pp. 111–136, 422 sqq.; v. 1862, p. 46 sqq. Idem, *Eine Neutestamentliche Entdeckung und deren Bestreitung, oder die Geschichts-Vision des Buches Henoch im Zusammenhang*, Zürich 1862. Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben*, for year 1864–65, pp. 196–204. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina* (1866), pp. 35–64. Sieffert, *Nonnulla ad apocryphi libri Henochi originem et compositionem nec non ad opiniones de regno Messiano eo prolata pertinentia*, Regimonti Pr. 1867 (the same work under the title, *De apocryphi libri Henochi origine et argumento*, Regimonti Pr. s. a.). Hallévi, "Recherches sur la langue de la rédaction primitive du livre d'Enoch" (*Journal asiatique*, 1867, April–May, pp. 352–395). Philippi, *Das Buch Henoch, sein Zeitalter und sein Verhältniss zum Judasbriefe*, Stuttg. 1868. Wittichen, *Die Idee des Menschen* (1868), pp. 63–71. Idem, *Die Idee des Reiches Gottes* (1872), pp. 118–133, 145–148, 149 sq. Gebhardt, "Die 70 Hirten des Buches Henoch und ihre Deutungen mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Barkochba-Hypothese" (*Merx' Archiv für wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. T.* vol. ii. part 2, 1872, pp. 163–246). Tideman, "De apocalypse van Henoch en het Essenisme" (*Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1875, pp. 261–296). Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah* (1877), pp. 17–73. Lipsius, art. "Enoch," in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. ii. (1880) pp. 124–128. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.'s*, § 498–500. Wieseler, "Zur Abfassungszeit des Buchs Henoch" (*Zeitschr. der DMG.* 1882, pp. 185–193).

3. *The Assumptio Mosis.*

It had long been known from a passage in Origen (*De princip.* iii. 2. 1) that the legend referred to in the Epistle of Jude (ver. 9) regarding a dispute between the archangel Michael and Satan about the body of Moses, was taken from an apocryphal book entitled the *Ascensio Mosis*. Some little information regarding this Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως had also been gleaned from quotations found in the Fathers and subsequent writers (see below). But it was not till somewhat recently that a large portion of this work in an old Latin version was discovered in the Ambrosian Library at Milan by Ceriani, and published by him (1861) in the first part of his *Monumenta*.

It is true the fragment bears no title, but its identity with the old *Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως* is evident from the following quotation (*Acta Synodi Nicaenae*, ii. 18, in Fabricius, i. 845): *Μέλλων ὁ προφήτης Μωυσῆς ἐξιέναι τοῦ βίου, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ Ἀναλήψεως Μωυσέως, προσκαλεσάμενος Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν Ναυῆ καὶ διαλεγόμενος πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔφη· Καὶ προεθεάσατό με ὁ θεὸς πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου εἶναί με τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ μεσίτην.* These same words also occur in Ceriani's fragment, i. 14: *Itaque excogitavit et invenit me, qui ab initio orbis terrarum prae paratus sum, ut sim arbiter testamenti illius.* Since its publication by Ceriani this writing has been edited by Hilgenfeld (*Clementis Romani Epist.* 1866, 2nd ed. 1876), Volkmar (Latin and German, 1867), Schmidt and Merx (Merx' *Archiv*, 1868), and Fritzsche (*Libri apocr.* 1871). A rendering back into the Greek from which the Latin version had been taken was executed by Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschr.* 1868, and *Messias Judaeorum*, 1869).

The following is an outline of the contents of the writing (and here we adopt Hilgenfeld's division of the chapters, which is also adhered to by Schmidt-Merx and Fritzsche, and departed from by Volkmar alone):—

Chap. i. 1–9. The introduction, in which we are given to understand that what follows was an *address which Moses gave to Joshua* when he appointed him to be his successor at Ammon beyond Jordan. In i. 10–17 Moses discloses to Joshua the fact that the course of his life has come to an end, and that he is on the point of departing to his fathers. By way of legacy he hands over to Joshua certain books of prophecies which he is requested to preserve in a place appointed by God for the purpose. In chap. ii. Moses reveals to Joshua in brief outline the future history of Israel, from the entrance into Palestine down to the destruction of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. In chap. iii. it is stated that a king (Nebuchadnezzar) will come from the east and destroy the city and the temple with fire, and carry away the inhabitants into his own domains. The captives will then remember that

all this had been already foretold by Moses. Chap. iv. In answer to the prayers of a man who is over them (Daniel), God will again take pity upon them and raise up a king (Cyrus), who will allow them to return to their native land. A few fragments of the tribes will return and will rebuild the holy place, and will remain steadfast in their allegiance to the Lord, only sad and sighing because they cannot sacrifice to the God of their fathers.¹⁸ Chap. v. And judgment will overtake their kings (their Gentile rulers). But they themselves (the Jews) will be divided in regard to the truth.¹⁹ And the altar will be defiled by men who are not (true) priests, but slaves born of slaves. And their scribes (magistri [et] doctores eorum) will be partial and will pervert justice. And their land will be full of unrighteousness. Chap. vi. Then kings will arise among them, and priests of the Most High God will be appointed, who will nevertheless commit wickedness even in the very holy of holies itself (plainly alluding to the Hasmonaeans). And these will be succeeded by an insolent monarch not belonging to the family of the priests, an arrogant and ungodly man. And he will deal with those who have preceded him as they deserve. He will cut off their proud ones with the sword, and bury their bodies in secret places so that nobody will know where they have been laid.²⁰ He will put to death old and young alike, and will not spare. Then there will be great dread of him among them throughout the land, and he will sit in judgment upon them, as did the Egyptians, for *four-and-thirty years* (all which obviously points to Herod the Great). And he will

¹⁸ The author seems to think that the sacrificial worship of the second temple could not be regarded as true worship owing to their being under Gentile supremacy, and because the conducting of the worship was in the hands of priests friendly to the Greeks.

¹⁹ Hilgenfeld has correctly held that the words "Et ipsi dividuntur ad veritatem" are to be regarded as beginning a new sentence. Schmidt and Merx have given a happy reproduction of the Greek text in the words *Καὶ αὐτοὶ διαμερισθήσονται πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν* (comp. Luke xi. 17).

²⁰ Comp. Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 10. 4: πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ φανερῶς καὶ λεληθότως ὡς τὸ Φρούριον ἀναγόμενοι, τὴν Ἰερουσαλήμ διεφθείροντο.

beget sons who will reign, though for shorter periods, as his successors. Cohorts of soldiers will come into their land, and a powerful monarch of the West (Quintilius Varus), who will conquer them and take them captive, and destroy a part of their temple with fire, while some of them he will crucify around their city.²¹ Chap. vii. After this will come the end of the times. Their course will have run after the expiry of yet four hours . . . (then follow several lines in the manuscript that are hardly legible). And there will reign among them wicked and ungodly men, who say that they are righteous. They are deceitful men, who will live only to please themselves, dissemblers in all their concerns, and at every hour of the day lovers of feasts, mere gluttons . . . (here again follows a hiatus). They devour the possessions of the poor, and declare that they do this out of pity. Their hands and their minds indulge in impurity, and their mouth utters high-sounding things; and further, they say, "touch me not lest thou defile me." . . . Chap. viii. Vengeance and wrath will come upon them, such as has never been among them from the beginning till the time when he will raise up to them the king of kings (Antiochus Epiphanes), who will crucify those who profess circumcision, and will cause them to get their children uncircumcised again, and to carry about the impure idols in public, and to condemn the word. Chap. ix. Then, in obedience to the command of that king, there will appear a man of the tribe of Levi, whose name will be *taxo*, who will have seven sons, to whom he will say: Behold, my sons, vengeance has once more come upon the people, a cruel vengeance without one touch of pity. For what nation

²¹ According to Fritzsch's amended form of it, the passage runs thus: Et producet natos (qui succedentes sibi [=ei] breviora tempora dominarent [*cod.* donarent]). In partes eorum cohortes [*cod.* mortis] venient et occidentis rex potens, qui expugnabit eos, et ducet captivos, et partem aedis ipsorum igni incendet, aliquos crucifiget circa coloniam eorum. Comp. with regard to the burning of the temple, Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 10. 2; and, for the crucifixions, *Antt.* xvii. 10. 10. What is in view therefore is the war of Varus in the year 4 B.C.

of the ungodly has ever had to endure anything equal to what has befallen us? Now listen, my sons, and let us do this. Let us fast three days, and on the fourth let us go into a cave which is in the field and die there rather than transgress the commandments of our Lord, the God of our fathers.²¹ Chap. x. And then will His kingdom appear throughout His whole creation. Then will the devil have an end, and sorrow will disappear along with him. For the Heavenly One will rise up from His throne. And the earth will tremble, the sun will withhold its light, and the horns of the moon will be broken. For God the Most High will appear and He will punish the Gentiles. Then wilt thou be happy, O Israel, and God will exalt thee. And now, Joshua (and here Moses turns again to address his successor), keep these words and this book. As for me, I am going to the resting-place of my fathers. Chap. xi. then goes on to relate how, after this address was ended, Joshua turned to Moses and lamented over the prospect of his departure, and regretted that, in consequence of his own weakness and incompetency, he would not be equal to the great task that had been imposed upon him. Thereupon chap. xii. proceeds to tell how Moses

²² It is usually assumed that chaps. viii.-ix. have direct reference to the closing period. But this appears to be only indirectly the case. For the author represents Moses as prophesying that, in the closing period, there will be a state of matters the like of which will never have been before except once, viz. in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. It is the description of this period of persecution under Antiochus that is also pursued in chap. ix., in which we accordingly meet with a legend similar to that in 2 Macc. vii. The object of the hiding in the cave is not merely to escape persecution, but also to find a place where the law can be observed without hindrance; comp. in particular 2 Macc. vi. 11 and the Rabbinical legends regarding Simon ben Jochai (Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 470 sqq.); also in general, Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, p. 128. There has been an unnecessary amount of puzzling of the brains over the enigmatical term *taxo*. It is undoubtedly to be looked upon as a corruption of the text. But one is at a loss to conceive how Hilgenfeld could ever suppose that under it there lay a reference to the Messiah. That would surely be a strange Messiah who could find nothing better to do than creep into a hole and there await the approach of death. Yet, according to Philippi, this latter is to be understood as referring to Christ and His disciples (pp. 177-180).

exhorted Joshua not to under-estimate his ability and not to despair of the future of his people, seeing that, however much they might be punished for their sins, they could never be utterly destroyed.

Here the manuscript ends. But all that has gone before leads us to expect, what the fragments tend to confirm, that in the subsequent portion of the book it had gone on to give an account of how Moses was taken away from the earth, the scene from which the whole work obtained the title of the *Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως*. It is also in this concluding part of the work that the dispute between the archangel Michael and Satan about the body of Moses must have occurred, which dispute, as is well known, is also mentioned in verse 9 of the Epistle of Jude.

Opinion is very much divided regarding the date of the composition of this book. Ewald, Wieseler, Drummond and Dillmann refer it to the first decade after the death of Herod; Hilgenfeld calculates that it may have been written in the course of the year 44–45 A.D.; Schmidt and Merx say some time between 54 and 64 A.D.; Fritzsche and Lucius trace it to the sixth decade of the first century A.D.; Langen thinks it must have been shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus (chap. viii. being erroneously interpreted as referring to this event); Hausrath prefers the reign of Domitian; Philippi, the second century of our era (the latter fixing on this date solely with the object of his being able to ascribe the authorship to a *Christian*, and of reversing the relation in which our book and ver. 9 of the Epistle of Jude stand to each other; see in particular, pp. 177, 182); while Volkmar (in accordance with his well-known predilection for the time of Barcocheba) thinks the date would be some time in the course of the year 137–138 A.D. Almost the whole of the critics just mentioned base their calculation upon the well-nigh illegible fragments of numbers in chap. vii. But surely one may fairly question the propriety of trying to found anything whatever upon lines so mutilated as those are; and if we had

no other data but these to help us to fix the date in question, we would have nothing for it but to abandon the attempt altogether. Still I cannot help thinking that there are two such data at our disposal. (1) Toward the end of chap. vi. it is plainly stated that the sons of Herod are to reign for a shorter period (*breviora tempora*) than their father. Now it is well known that Philip and Antipas reigned longer than their father; and one cannot help seeing the embarrassment to which those words have led in the case of all those critics who refer the composition of our book to a latish date. They are capable of being explained solely on the assumption that the work was written toward the commencement of the reign of the last-mentioned princes. (2) It is as good as universally admitted that the concluding sentences of chap. vi. refer to the war of Varus in the year 4 B.C.²³ When therefore chap. vii. goes on to say: *Ex quo facto finientur tempora*, surely there can hardly be room for any other inference than this, that the author wrote subsequent to the war of Varus. In that case the enigmatical numbers that follow in this same chapter cannot be supposed to be a continuation of the narrative, but are to be regarded as a calculation added by way of supplement after the narrative has been brought down to the date at which the author was writing. Only, considering how mutilated those numbers are, every attempt to explain them must prove a failure. Consequently the view of Ewald, Wieseler, Drummond and Dillmann with regard to the date of the composition of our book is substantially correct.

Some light is thrown upon the author's *party leanings*, partly by chap. vii. and partly by chap. x. The *homines pestilentiosi* against whom he inveighs in chap. vii. are by no means the Herodian princes (so Hilgenfeld), nor the Sadducees

²³ So Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Schmidt-Merx, Wieseler, Dillmann and others, also Langen, *Theol. Literaturbl.* 1871, No. 3, Sp. 90 (where he retracts his previous absolutely untenable reference of the passage to Pompey; see *Judenth. in Paläst.* p 109).

(so Volkmar, p. 105 ; Geiger, p. 45 sq. ; Lucius, p. 116 sqq.), nor the Sadducees and Pharisees (so Wieseler, p. 642 sq., who refers vv. 3, 4 to the former and vv. 6–10 to the latter) ; but the Pharisees and the Pharisees alone, to whom every word is unmistakably applicable (so Ewald, *Gesch.* v. 81 ; Schmidt-Merx, p. 121 ; Philippi, p. 176). Our author then was *inimical to the Pharisees*, though, at the same time, he was neither an Essene, for as such he would not have jeered, as he does in chap. vii., at the Pharisaical purifications (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 10), nor a Sadducee, for, according to chap. x., he looks forward with the most fervent longings for the advent of the kingdom of God, and that too a kingdom accompanied with outward pomp and circumstance. Wieseler is perhaps nearest the truth in seeking him among the Zealots who, notwithstanding their kinship to the Pharisees, had still an intense dislike to them, because they looked upon them as being too dogmatic and formal as regards the law and too undecided with respect to their politics. That the book was written in Palestine may, to say the least of it, be accepted as the most obvious and natural supposition. Hilgenfeld and Hausrath have suggested Rome, without however alleging any ground for doing so. On the assumption that it was composed in Palestine, it becomes further probable that it was written originally in Hebrew or Aramaic. But we are not in a position positively to assert this. Only this much is certain, that our old Latin version was taken from the Greek.

Of the legend regarding the death of Moses extensive and varied use has been made in Jewish literature. Besides our book there fall to be mentioned: Philo (*Vita Mosis*), Josephus (*Antt.* iv. *fin.*), *Midrash Tanchuma debarum* (translated into German by Wünsche, 1882), and a *Midrash* which treats specially of the departure of Moses (פְּטִירַת מֹשֶׁה, *Petirath Moshe*). This latter has been frequently published in two recensions, among others by Gilb. Gaulminius, Paris 1629, with a Latin translation; then this Latin translation was published by itself by John Alb. Fabricius, Hamburg 1714, and by Gfrörer, *Prophetæ veteres pseudepigraphi*, Stuttg. 1840 (see Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, ii. 1278 sq., 1395. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 146. Steinschneider, *Catal. librorum Hebraeorum in Biblioth. Bodl.* p. 630 sq.). For one of these two recensions see also

Jellinek, *Beth ha-Midrash*, vol. i. 1853. Also a third, which Jellinek regards as the oldest, in his *Beth ha-Midrash*, vol. vi. 1877. Comp. in general on these legends: Bernard's edition of Josephus, note on *Antt.* iv. *fin.* Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 839 sqq. Beer, *Leben Moses nach Auffassung der jüdischen Sage*, Leipzig 1863. Benedetti, *Vita e morte di Mosé, leggende ebr. tradotte, illustrate e comparate*, Pisa 1879 (on which see *Magazin für die Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1881, pp. 57-60). Leop. v. Ranke, *Weltgeschichte*, vol. iii. 2nd part (1883), pp. 12-33.

Care must be taken not to confound our *Assumptio Mosis* with the Christian *Apocalypse of Mosis* in Greek which has been edited by Tischendorf (*Apocalypses apocryphae*, Lips. 1866); similarly, from a Milanese manuscript, by Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et profana*, v. 1. This work belongs to the class of Adamic books, for it records the history of the life and death of Adam as it had been revealed to Moses. On this comp. Tischendorf, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1851, p. 432 sqq. Le Hir, *Etudes Bibliques* (1869), ii. pp. 110-120. Rönisch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, p. 470 sqq. According to Euthalius and others, Gal. vi. 15 (οὔτε περιτομή τι ἐστὶν οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ καὶνὴ κτίσις) found a place in an *Apocryphum Mosis*, where, of course, it could only have been borrowed from the Epistle to the Galatians (Euthalius in Zaccagni's *Collectanea monumentorum veterum*, 1698, p. 561 = Gallandi, *Biblioth. Patr.* x. 260. Similarly Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 48, and an anonymous list of the quotations in the New Testament given in Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum*, i. 195 = *Diarium Italicum*, p. 212, and in Cotelier, *Patr. apost.*, note on *Const. apost.* vi. 16). Now, seeing that Euthalius also makes use of precisely the same formula of reference (Μουσίως ἀποκρύφου) as in the case of verse 9 of the Epistle of Jude (Zaccagni, p. 485), we may perhaps venture to assume that he had before him a Christian version of the *Assumptio Mosis*, in which Gal. vi. 15 had been inserted. Syncellus and the author of the anonymous list just referred to have clearly drawn upon Euthalius. *Gnostic Books of Moses* are mentioned as being in use among the Sethites by Epiphanius. *Haer.* xxxix. 5. For *Apocrypha Mosis* generally, see *Const. apost.* vi. 16. Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 825-849, ii. 111-130. Lücke, *Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis*, pp. 232-235. Dillmann, art. "Pseudepigraphen" in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 352 sqq. (Nos. 4, 18, 26, 29, 35).

Use of the *Assumptio Mosis* in the Christian Church: Epistle of Jude, ver. 9. Clement of Alexandria, *Adumbrat. in epist. Judae* (in Zahn's *Supplementum Clementinum*, 1884, p. 84): Hic confirmat assumptionem Moysi. Other legends in Clement of Alexandria regarding the death and ascension of Moses, have in all probability been borrowed no less from our writing (*Strom.* i. 23. 153, vi. 15. 132. Comp. Zahn, p. 96 sq.). Origen, *De principiis*, iii. 2. 1: Et primo quidem in Genesi serpens Evam seduxisse describitur, de quo in Adscensione Mosis, cujus libelli meminit in epistola sua apostolus Judas, Michael archangelus cum diabolo disputans de corpore Mosis ait a diabolo inspiratum serpentem causam exstitisse praevaricationis Adae et Evae. Idem, *In Josuam homil.* ii. 1 (ed. Lommatzsch, xi. 22): Denique et in libello quodam, licet in canone non habeatur, mysterii tamen

hujus figura describitur. Refertur enim, quia duo Moses videbantur. unus vivus in spiritu, alius mortuus in corpore. Didymus Alex., *In epist. Judae enarratio* (in Gallandi, *Biblioth. Patr.* vi. 307), finds in Jude, ver. 9, evidence in favour of the view that even the devil is not evil by nature or *substantialiter*, and alleges that the adversarii hujus contemplationis praescribunt praesenti epistolae et Moyseos assumptioni propter eum locum ubi significatur verbum Archangeli de corpore Moyseos ad diabolum factum. *Acta Synodi Nicaen.* ii. 20 (in Fabricius, i. 844): 'Εν βιβλίῳ δὲ Ἀναλήψεως Μωυσείως Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος διαλεγόμενος τῷ διαβόλῳ λέγει κ.τ.λ. For another passage from these same Acts, see p. 74 above. Evodii epist. ad Augustin. (*Augustin. epist.* colix. in Fabricius, i. 845 sq.): Quonquam et in apocryphis et in secretis ipsius Moysi, quae scriptura caret auctoritate, tunc cum ascenderet in montem ut moreretur vi corporis, efficitur ut aliud esset quod terrae mandaretur, aliud quod angelo comitanti sociaretur. Sed non satis urget me apocryphorum praeferre sententiam illis superioribus rebus definitis. For additional passages, and chiefly from Greek scholia, see Rönsch, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1869, pp. 216–220. Hilgenfeld, *Clementis Romani epist.* 2nd ed. pp. 127–129. In the lists of the apocryphal books we find a *Διαθήκη Μωυσείως* and an Ἀνάληψις Μωυσείως (the one immediately after the other in the stichometry of Nicephorus, and in the “Synopsis Athanasii” as given in Credner’s *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, pp. 121, 145; as also in the anonymous list edited by Pitra and others, see v. 7 below). Now, seeing that the writing that has come down to us is in point of fact a “Testament (will) of Moses,” though, as we have already seen, it is quoted in the Acts of the Council of Nicaea under the title Ἀνάληψις Μωυσείως, it may be assumed that both these designations were the titles of two separate divisions of one and the same work, the first of which has been preserved, whereas the quotations in the Fathers almost all belong to the second.

Editions of the Latin text: Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et prof.* vol. i. fasc. i. (Milan 1861), pp. 55–64. Hilgenfeld, *Clementis Romani epistolae* (likewise under the title *Novum Testam. extra canonem receptum*, fasc. i.), 1st ed. 1866, pp. 93–115, 2nd ed. 1876, pp. 107–135. Volkmar, *Mose Prophetie und Himmelfahrt, eine Quelle für das Neue Testament, zum erstenmale deutsch herausgegeben im Zusammenhang der Apokrypha und der Christologie überhaupt*, Leipzig 1867. Schmidt (Moriz) and Merx, “Die Assumptio Mosis mit Einleitung und erklärenden Anmerkungen herausgegeben” (Merx’ *Archiv für wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. T.’s*, vol. i. Part ii. 1868, pp. 111–152). Fritzsche, *Libri apocryphi Vet. Test. graece* (Lips. 1871), pp. 700–730; comp. *Prolegom.* pp. 32–36. A rendering back into the Greek was attempted by Hilgenfeld, for which see *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1868, pp. 273–309, 356, and his *Messias Judaeorum*, 1869, pp. 435–468; comp. *Prolegom.* pp. 70–76.

For contributions toward the *criticism* and *exposition* of our book, see, besides the editions just mentioned, Ewald, *Göttinger gelehrte Anz.* 1862, St. 1. Idem, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. v. (3rd ed. 1867), pp. 73–82. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina* (1866), pp. 102–111. Idem, in Reusch’s *Theolog. Literaturbl.* 1871, No. 3. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für*

wissensch. Theol. 1867, pp. 217-223. *Ibid.* Haupt, p. 448. Rönsch, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* vol. xi. 1868, pp. 76-108, 466-468; xii. 1869, pp. 213-228; xiv. 1871, pp. 89-92; xvii. 1874, pp. 542-562; xxviii. 1885, pp. 102-104. Philippi, *Das Buch Henoch* (1868), pp. 166-191. Colani, "L'Assomption de Moïse" (*Revue de Théologie*, 1868, 2nd part). Carriere, *Note sur le Taxo de l'Assomption de Moïse* (*ibid.* 1868, 2nd part). Wieseler, "Die jüngst aufgefundenene Aufnahme Moses nach Ursprung und Inhalt untersucht" (*Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1868, pp. 622-648). Idem, "Θαοσί und Taxo" (*Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch.* 1882, p. 193 sq.). Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben*, 1868, pp. 41-47. Heidenheim, "Beiträge zum bessern Verständniss der *Ascensio Mosis*" (*Vierteljahrschr. für deutsch. und Englisch-theol. Forschung und Kritik*, vol. iv. (Part I. 1869). Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. iv. pp. 76-80 (1st ed. iii. 278-282). Stähelin, *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1874, pp. 216-218. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah* (1877), pp. 74-84. Lucius, *Der Essenismus* (1881), pp. 111-119, 127 sq. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.'s*, § 572. Dillmann, art. "Pseudepigraphen" in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 352 sq. Deane, "The Assumption of Moses" (*Monthly Interpreter*, March 1885, pp. 321-348).

4. *The Apocalypse of Baruch.*

The large Peshito manuscript of Milan (*Cod. Ambros. B. 21, inf.*) also contains a *Revelation of Baruch*, regarding which we have no further information of a trustworthy kind. Only a small fraction of it, viz. the epistle addressed to the nine and a half tribes in the captivity, inserted at the close (chaps. lxxviii.-lxxxvi.), has been otherwise transmitted to us and already printed in the Paris and London Polyglots. But beyond this there is hardly any other trace of it to be met with (see below). The book was first introduced to public notice through a Latin version prepared and edited by Ceriani (1866). This scholar subsequently published the Syrian text itself (in ordinary type in 1871, and in a photolithographed fac-simile in 1883). Fritzsche, after making a few emendations upon it, embodied Ceriani's Latin version in his edition of the Apocrypha (1871). The book purports to be a writing composed by Baruch in which he recounts (using the first person throughout) what happened to him immediately before and after the destruction of Jerusalem, and what revelations were made to him. The contents are substantially as follows:—*First section*, chaps. i.-v.: In the five

and twentieth year of the reign of Jeconiah [a complete confounding of dates by which the author means to indicate the time of the destruction of Jerusalem] God intimates to Baruch the impending ruin of Jerusalem and the kingdom of Judah. Chaps. vi.-viii.: On the following day the Chaldean army appears before the walls of the city. However it is not the Chaldeans but four angels that destroy it. No sooner is this done than the Chaldeans enter the city and carry away its inhabitants into captivity. Chaps. ix.-xii.: While Jeremiah accompanies these latter, Baruch, in obedience to the command of God, remains behind among the ruins. *Second section*, chaps. xiii.-xv.: After he had fasted seven days, God informs him that one day judgment would overtake the Gentiles as well and that in his own time; and He calms his apprehensions generally about the prosperity of the ungodly and the calamities of the righteous. Chaps. xvi.-xx.: Baruch brings forward yet further grounds of perplexity, but God discourages his doing so, and ultimately orders him to prepare, by another seven days' fasting, for receiving a revelation of the order of the times. *Third section*, xxi.-xxvi.: After fasting and praying to God, he is first of all censured by God for his doubts and pusillanimity, and then, in answer to his question as to when the judgment of the ungodly would take place and how long it would last, God communicates to him the following (chaps. xxvii.-xxviii.): The time of the tribulation will be divided into twelve parts, and each part will bring with it its own special disaster. But the measure of that time will be two parts, weeks of seven weeks (*duae partes hebdomades septem hebdomadarum*). Chaps. xxviii.-xxx.: To the further question of Baruch whether the tribulation would be confined to only *one* part of the earth or extend to the whole of it, God answers that it will of course affect the whole earth. But after that the Messiah will appear and times of joy and glory begin to dawn. Chaps. xxxi.-xxxiv.: After receiving those revelations Baruch summons a meeting of the elders of the people in the valley of Kidron, when he announces to them

that: post modicum tempus concutietur aedificatio Sion, ut aedificetur iterum. Verum non permanebit ipsa illa aedificatio, sed iterum post tempus eradicabitur, et permanebit desolata usque ad tempus. Et postea oportet renovari in gloria, et coronabitur in perpetuum. *Fourth section*, chaps. xxxv.-xxxviii.: Hereupon, Baruch, as he sits lamenting upon the ruins of the Holy of holies, falls asleep and in a dream is favoured with ■ new revelation. He sees a large forest surrounded by mountains and rocks. Over against it grew a vine, and from under the vine flowed a spring which developed into large streams that made channels for themselves underneath the forest and the mountains till these latter fell in and were swept away. Only a single cedar was left, but at last it too was uprooted. Thereupon the vine and the spring came and ordered the cedar to betake itself to where the rest of the forest had already gone. And the cedar was burnt up, but the vine continued to grow and everything around it flourished. Chaps. xxxviii.-xl.: In answer to Baruch's request God interprets the dream to him as follows: Behold the kingdom that destroys Zion will itself be overthrown and subjugated by another that will succeed it. And this in its turn will be overthrown and a third will arise. And then this also will be swept away and a fourth will arise, more terrible than all that have preceded it. And when the time for its overthrow has come then Mine Anointed will appear, who is like a spring and a vine, and He will annihilate the armies of that kingdom. And that cedar means the last remaining general (*dux*, prince?) in it who will be condemned and put to death by Mine Anointed. And the reign of Mine Anointed will endure for ever. Chaps. xli.-xliii.: Baruch receives a commission to exhort the people and at the same time to prepare himself, by renewed fasting, for fresh revelations. Chaps. xliv.-xlvi.: Baruch exhorts the elders of the people. *Fifth section*, chaps. xlvii.-xlvi. 24: He fasts seven days and prays to God. Chap. xlviii. 25-50: The new revelations have reference, in the first instance, to the tribulations of the last

time generally. Chaps. xlix.-lii.: When, upon this, Baruch expresses a desire to learn something more about the nature of the new resurrection bodies of the righteous his wish is complied with; not only so, but he is enlightened with regard to the future blessedness of the righteous and the misery of the ungodly generally. *Sixth section*, chap. liii.: In a new vision Baruch sees a huge cloud rising from the sea and covering the whole earth and discharging first black water and then clear, then black again and then clear, and so on twelve times in succession. At last there came black waters and after them bright lightning, which latter brought healing to the whole earth, and ultimately there came twelve streams and subjected themselves to this lightning. Chaps. liv.-lv.: In answer to his prayer Baruch receives through the angel Ramiel the following interpretation of the vision: Chaps. lvi.-lvii.: The huge cloud means the present world. The *first*, the *dark* water means the sin of Adam, whereby he brought death and ruin into the world. The *second*, the *clear* water means Abraham and his descendants, who, although not in possession of the written law, nevertheless complied with its requirements. The *third*, the *dark* water represents the subsequent generations of sinful humanity, particularly the Egyptians. The *fourth*, the *clear* water means the appearing of Moses, Aaron, Joshua, and Caleb, and the giving of the law, and God's revelations to Moses. The *fifth*, the *dark* water represents the works of the Amorites and the magicians, in which Israel also participated. The *sixth*, the *clear* water represents the time of David and Solomon. The *seventh*, the *dark* water means the revolt of Jeroboam and the sins of his successors and the overthrow of the kingdom of the ten tribes. The *eighth*, the *clear* water means the integrity of Hezekiah and his deliverance from Sennacherib. The *ninth*, the *dark* water means the universal ungodliness in the days of Manasseh and the announcing of the destruction of Jerusalem. The *tenth*, the *clear* water denotes the reign of the good king Josiah. The *eleventh*, the *dark* water represents the present tribulation

(*i.e.* in Baruch's own time), the destruction of Jerusalem, and the Babylonian captivity. Chap. lxviii.: But the *twelfth*, the *clear* water means that the people of Israel will again experience times of joy, that Jerusalem will be rebuilt, that the offering of sacrifices will be resumed, and that the priests will return to their duties. Chaps. lxix.-lxxi.: But the *last dark* water which is yet to come, and which proves worse than all that went before, means this: that tribulation and confusion will come upon the whole earth. A few will rule over the many, the poor will become rich and the rich will become poor, knaves will be exalted above heroes, wise men will keep silence and fools will speak. And in obedience to God's command the nations which He has prepared for the purpose will come and war with such of the leaders as are still left (*cum ducibus, qui reliqui fuerint tunc*). And it will come to pass that he who escapes from the war will perish by the earthquake, and he who escapes from the earthquake will perish by fire, and he who escapes the fire will perish with hunger. And he who escapes the whole of those evils will be given into the hands of Mine Anointed. Chaps. lxxii.-lxxiv.: But this dreadful dark water will at length be followed by yet more *clear water*. This means that the time of Mine Anointed will come and that He will judge the nations and sit for ever upon the throne of His kingdom. And all tribulation will come to an end, and peace and joy will reign upon the earth. Chaps. lxxv.-lxxvi.: Baruch thanks God for the revelation with which he had been favoured, and then God directs him to wait for forty days and then go to the top of a certain mountain where all the different regions of the earth would pass before his view. After this he is to be removed from the world. *Seventh section*, chap. lxxvii.: Baruch delivers a hortatory address to the people, and at the request of the latter he, on the 21st day of the eighth month, also composes two hortatory addresses to be sent to their brethren in the captivity, one to the nine and a half tribes and the other to the remaining two and a half. Chaps. lxxviii.-lxxxvi.:

The import of the first of the two addresses is as follows: Baruch in the first place reminds his readers that the judgment of God which has overtaken them is a just judgment, he then tells them of the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar and the carrying away of the inhabitants into captivity, and intimates to them the judgment of God that is awaiting their oppressors and then their own ultimate deliverance. In conclusion, he founds upon this an exhortation to continue steadfast in their devotion to God and His law. Chap. lxxxvii.: He sends this epistle to the nine and a half tribes in captivity through the medium of an eagle.

At this point the book, as we now possess it, breaks off. But originally it must have contained somewhat more, for from lxxvii. 19 there is reason to infer that the epistle addressed to the nine and a half tribes was followed by a similar one addressed to the other two and a half tribes. And from chap. lxxvi. it is to be presumed that the book would proceed to tell how Baruch was shown all the countries of the world from the top of a mountain and was thereafter taken away from the earth.

As regards the date of the composition of our apocalypse this much at least may be affirmed with certainty, that it was not written till after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. For in chap. xxxii. 2-4, Baruch announces to the assembled people that (after its first destruction by Nebuchadnezzar) Jerusalem is to be rebuilt again. *But that this building will not continue to stand, but that it will in like manner be destroyed again.* And then the city will lie waste for a long period, until the glorious time when it will be rebuilt and crowned for ever. But, with the exception of this passage, there is not another that throws any light upon the date of the composition of our book. For nothing bearing upon this is to be gathered from the obscure passage in which we are informed that the time of tribulation is to last "two parts, weeks of seven weeks" (xxviii. 2: *duae partes hebdomades septem hebdomadarum*), for the meaning of these words is as uncer-

tain as it is obscure. Consequently the calculations which Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, and Dillmann above all have tried to found upon this passage have no certain basis on which to rest. Possibly one would be much more likely to find some clue to the date in question in *the affinity which this work bears to the Fourth Book of Ezra*. For the points of contact between both those books in regard to thought and expression alike are (as Langen has pointed out, pp. 6–8) so numerous that we must of necessity assume either that they were written by one and the same author, or that the one borrowed from the other. It is now almost universally believed that it may be proved with a greater or less degree of certainty that our book has drawn upon the Fourth Book of Ezra (so Ewald, Langen, Hilgenfeld, Hausrath, Stähelin, Renan, Drummond, Dillmann). It appears to me however that as yet no decisive arguments have been advanced in support of this view. In the case of Langen, who was the first to go thoroughly into this question, and who has done much to influence subsequent opinion on the matter, his main argument was that the Book of Baruch corrected, as he supposed, the somewhat crude notions of Ezra respecting the doctrine of original sin. In order that the reader may be in a more favourable position for estimating the value of this argument, we will here subjoin in parallel columns what each of the two books says on this point:—

EZRA :

iii. 7 : Et huic (Adamo) mandasti diligere viam tuam, et praeteriviteam; et statim instituisti in eum mortem et in nationibus ejus.

iii. 21–22: Cor enim malignum bajulans primus, Adam transgressus et victus est; sed et omnes, qui de eo nati sunt. Et facta est permanens infirmitas.

iv. 30 : Quoniam granum seminis mali seminatum est in corde Adam ab initio, et quantum impietatis generavit usque nunc, et generat usque dum veniat area!

BARUCH :

xvii. 3 : (Adam) mortem attulit et abscidit annos eorum, qui ab eo geniti fuerunt.

xxiii. 4 : Quando peccavit Adam et decreta fuit mors contra eos, qui gignerentur, etc.

xlvi. 42 : O quid fecisti Adam omnibus, qui a te geniti sunt!

liv. 15, 19 : Si enim Adam prior peccavit, et attulit mortem super omnes immaturam; sed etiam illi qui ex eo nati sunt, unusquisque ex eis praeeparavit animae suae tormentum futurum : et iterum unusquisque ex

vii. 48: O tu quid fecisti Adam ? Si enim tu peccasti, non est factus soli tuus casus, sed et nostrum, qui ex te advenimus.	eis elegit sibi gloriam futuram . . Non est ergo Adam causa, nisi animae suae tantum ; nos vero unusquisque fuit animae suae Adam.
--	---

Now Langen supposes that the last of the passages quoted from Baruch (liv. 19: Non est ergo Adam causa, nisi animae suae tantum ; nos vero unusquisque fuit animae suae Adam) is above all intended to modify the somewhat harsh view of Ezra. But one can easily see that the utterances of Baruch on other occasions are quite as blunt as those of Ezra. And, on the other hand, there are passages to be met with in Ezra in which the author emphasizes quite as strongly as Baruch liv. 19, though in different terms, the thought that every man is to blame for his own ruin. To take only a single example, compare viii. 55-61. Here then we have not even an actual difference of view, far less a correction of the one writer on the part of the other. Further, such other reasons as have been advanced in favour of the priority of Ezra and the dependent character of Baruch are merely considerations of an extremely general kind which may be met with, considerations equally well calculated to prove quite the reverse. Some are inclined to think that in the case of the author of the Fourth Book of Ezra "there is more of a despairing frame of mind, that his striving after light and his desire to have his apprehensions quieted are deeper, more urgent, and of a more overmastering character, that, because the impressions produced by the dreadful events are rather fresher in his mind, his narrative is also, for this very reason and in spite of its verbosity, the more impressive of the two, and so on" (so Dillmann). My own opinion is that it is quite the converse of this, and that it would be nearer the truth to say that it is precisely in the case of Baruch that this problem is uppermost, viz. How is the calamity of Israel and the impunity of its oppressors possible and conceivable? while in the case of Ezra, though this problem concerns him too, still there is a question that almost lies yet nearer his heart, viz.

Why is it that so many perish and so few are saved? The subordination of the former of these questions to the other, which is a purely theological one, appears to me rather to indicate that Ezra is of a later date than Baruch. Not only so, but it is decidedly of a more finished character, and is distinguished by greater maturity of thought and a greater degree of lucidity than the last-mentioned book. But this is a point in regard to which it is scarcely possible to arrive at a definite conclusion. And hence we are equally unable to say whether our book was written shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem (so Hilgenfeld, Fritzsche, Drummond), or during the reign of Domitian (so Ewald), or in the time of Trajan (so Langen, Wieseler, Renan, Dillmann). Undoubtedly the most probable supposition of all is that it was composed not long after the destruction of the holy city, when the question "How could God permit such a disaster?" was still a burning one. It is older at all events than the time of *Papias*, whose chimerical fancies about the millennial kingdom (Irenaeus, v. 33. 3) are borrowed from our Apocalypse (xxix. 5).²⁴ The existing Syrian text has been taken from the Greek (see Langen, p. 8 sq.; Kneucker, p. 192 sq.; Dillmann, p. 358).

With the exception of the passage in *Papias* just mentioned, no certain trace of the *use of our book* in the Christian Church is anywhere to be met with. There is every reason to believe that it had been pushed into the background by the kindred Ezra-apocalypse. Still the fact of its finding a place in the *Peshito manuscript* of Milan serves to show that it was still in use at a later period at least in the Syrian Church. In the lists of the apocrypha given in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus and the "Synopsis Athanasii" (in Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, pp. 121, 145) there are added at the close: Βαρούχ, Ἀββακούμ, Ἐξέκκλη καὶ Δανιὴλ ψευδεπίγραφα. But it is

²⁴ In his edition of Irenaeus (ii. 417), Harvey attempts to show that the text of *Papias* presupposes a *Syrian original* on which it is based, for he thinks that a certain anomaly occurring in his text may be most easily accounted for by the hypothesis of such an original. If this were correct, it would be of considerable interest as regards the matter now in hand. The anomaly in question admits however of being otherwise explained. See Gebhardt and Harnack's edition of the *Epistle of Barnabas* (2nd ed 1878), p. 87.

extremely uncertain whether, by the first-mentioned book, it is our apocalypse that is meant, for besides the Baruch of the Greek Bible, and which in the lists just referred to is included among the canonical books, there were also other *apocryphal writings bearing this name*. (1) There are considerable fragments of a *gnostic Book of Baruch* given in the *Philosophumena* v. 26–27 (comp. v. 24). (2) A *Christian Book of Baruch*, which is akin to our apocalypse and has borrowed largely from it, has been published in Ethiopic by Dillmann under the title “*Reliqua verborum Baruchi*” (in Dillmann’s *Chrestomathia aethiopica*, Lips. 1866), as it had been previously in Greek in a Greek *Menaeus* (Venetiis 1609), and recently again by Ceriani under the title “*Paralipomena Jeremiae*” (*Monumenta sacra et profana*, vol. v. 1, Mediol. 1868), and finally in a German version by Prätorius (*Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1872, pp. 230–247), and by König (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1877, pp. 318–338). On this book comp. also Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vii. 183. Fritzsche, *Libri apocr. prolegom.* p. 32. Sachsse, *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1874, p. 268 sq. Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch*, p. 196 sq. Dillmann in Herzog’s *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 358 sq. (3) In the *Altercatio Simonis Judaei et Theophili Christiani*, lately published by Harnack, there occurs the following passage from a Book of Baruch (Gebhardt and Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. i. part 3, 1883, p. 25): *Prope finem libri sui de nativitate ejus [scil. Christi] et de habitu vestis et de passione ejus et de resurrectione ejus prophetavit dicens: Hic unctus meus, electus meus, vulvae incontaminatae jaculatus, natus et passus dicitur*. Judging from the Christology implied in this passage, the Baruch here in question can only have been composed at the soonest in the fourth century of our era (see Harnack, p. 46). Further, in Cyprian’s *Testim.* iii. 29, we find that in one manuscript there has been inserted a quotation from some Book of Baruch or other, which quotation, however, we have no means of verifying. (4) Tichonrawow contemplates editing an Apocalypse of Baruch in the *old Slavonic* version (see *Theol. Literaturztg.* 1877, p. 658). Whether it has as yet appeared, and what its relation to other Books of Baruch with which we are already acquainted, I am unable to say.

The epistle to the nine and a half tribes in the captivity, which forms the conclusion of our apocalypse, has been already printed in the Paris Polyglot, vol. ix., in the London Polyglot, vol. iv., in Lagarde’s edition of the Syrian version of the apocrypha (*Libri Vet. Test. apocryphi syriace*, ed. de Lagarde, Lips. 1861), also in Latin in Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* ii. 145–155. Also in an English and French version; see Fritzsche’s *Exeget. Handbuch zu den Apokryphen*, i. 175 sq., and *Libri Apocr.* p. xxxi. Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch*, p. 190 sq.

Ceriani’s Latin version of our apocalypse appeared in the *Monumenta sacra et profana*, vol. i. fasc. 2 (Mediol. 1866), pp. 73–98. For this see also Fritzsche, *Libri apocryphi Vet. Test. graece* (Lips. 1871), pp. 654–699. The Syrian text was edited by Ceriani in the *Monumenta sacra et profana*, vol. v. fasc. 2 (Mediol. 1871), pp. 113–180. This latter was also included in the photo-lithographed fac-simile of the whole manuscript, published under the title *Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex codice*

Ambrosiano sec. fere VI. photolithographice edita curante et adnotante Antonio Maria Ceriani, 2 vols. in 4 parts, Milan 1876-1883 (the Apocalypse of Baruch being in the last part). *Comp. Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1876, p. 329; 1878, p. 228; 1881, col. 4; 1884, col. 27.

Critical inquiries: Langen, *De apocalypsi Baruch anno superiori primum edita commentatio*, Friburgi in Brisgovia, 1867 (xxiv. p. 4). Ewald, *Göttinger gel. Anzeigen*, 1867, p. 1706 sqq. Idem, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vii. 83-87. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1869, pp. 437-440. Idem, *Messias Judaeorum*, p. lxiii. sq. Wieseler, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1870, p. 288 (in his article on the Fourth Book of Ezra). Fritzsche, *Libri apocr. Prolegom.* pp. 30-32. Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. iv. 88 sq. (1st ed. iii. 290). Stähelin, *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1874, p. 211 sqq. Renan, "L'Apocalypse de Baruch" (*Journal des Savants*, April 1877, pp. 222-231). Idem, *Les évangiles*, 1877, pp. 517-530. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, 1877, pp. 117-132. Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch*, 1879, pp. 190-198. Kaulen in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlex.* 2nd ed. i. 1058 sq. (art. "Apokryphen-Literatur"). Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 356-358 (art. "Pseudepigraphen"). Deane, "The Apocalypse of Baruch," i. (*Monthly Interpreter*, April 1885, pp. 451-461).

5. *The Fourth Book of Ezra.*

Of all the Jewish apocalypses none has been so widely circulated in the early Church and in the Church of the Middle Ages as the so-called Fourth Book of Ezra. By Greek and Latin Fathers it is used as a genuine prophetical work (see below). The fact of there being Syrian, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Armenian versions of the book is evidence of the extent to which it was circulated in the East. Then the circumstance that a Latin version has come down to us in a large number of Bible manuscripts is calculated to show the favour with which, in like manner, it was still regarded by the Church of Rome in the Middle Ages. It was for this reason no doubt that it was also added as an appendix to the authorized Roman Vulgate. Not only so, it even found its way into German versions of the Protestant Bible (see more below). The whole of the five versions which we possess are taken, some of them directly, others indirectly, from a Greek text (now no longer extant), which, moreover, is to be regarded as the original one.

The text of the Latin Vulgate consists of sixteen chapters. But, as is generally admitted, the two first and the two last of

these, which do not appear in the Oriental versions, are later additions by a Christian hand. Accordingly in its original form the book would only embrace the portion between chaps. iii. and xiv. inclusive. The contents of the original work are divided into *seven visions*, with which, as he himself informs us, Ezra had been favoured. *First vision* (iii. 1–v. 20): In the thirtieth year after the destruction of the city (Jerusalem) Ezra is in Babylon, and in his prayer to God he complains of the calamities of Israel on the one hand, and of the prosperity of the Gentile nations on the other (iii. 1–36). The angel Uriel comes, and, in the first place, reproves him for his complaints (iv. 1–21), and then proceeds to remind him that wickedness has its appointed time (iv. 22–32), just as the dead have an appointed time during which they require to stay in the nether world (iv. 33–43). But the most of the distress is already past, and its end will be announced by means of definite signs (iv. 44–v. 13). Ezra is so exhausted by the revelation that has been imparted to him that he requires to be strengthened by the angel. By fasting for seven days he prepares himself for a new revelation (v. 14–20). *Second vision* (v. 21–vi. 34): Ezra renews his complaints, and is once more rebuked by the angel (v. 21–40). This latter points out to him that in the history of mankind one thing must come after another, and that the beginning and the end cannot come at one and the same time. Ezra is reminded, however, that he may nevertheless see that the end is already approaching. It will be brought about by God Himself, the Creator of the world (v. 41–vi. 6). The signs of the end are more fully enumerated than in the previous vision (vi. 7–29). Uriel here takes leave of Ezra, with the promise of further revelations (vi. 30–34). *Third vision* (vi. 35–ix. 25): Ezra complains again, and is again rebuked by the angel (vi. 35–vii. 25). Upon this he is favoured with the following revelation:—Whenever the signs (enumerated in the preceding visions) begin to appear, then those delivered from the calamities in question will see won-

derful things: For my Son, the Anointed One, will appear with His retinue, and He will diffuse joy among those that are spared, and that for four hundred years. And at the expiry of those years, my Son, the Anointed One, will die, He and all who have the breath of life. For the space of seven days, corresponding to the seven creative days, there will not be a single human being upon the earth. Then the dead will rise; and the Most High will come and sit upon the judgment-seat, and proceed with the judgment (vii. 26-35).²⁵ And the place of torment will be revealed, and over against it the place of rest. And the length of the day of judgment will be a year-week (vi. 1-17 = Bensly, vv. 36-44). Only a few men will be saved. The majority will be consigned to perdition (vi. 18-48 = Bensly, vv. 45-74). Moreover, the ungodly do not enter at death into habitations of rest, but when they die are at once consigned to sevenfold torment, of which this also forms a part, that they find it no longer possible to repent, and that they foresee their future condemnation. But the righteous, on the other hand, enter into rest, and experience sevenfold joy, of which, among other things, this forms a part, that they foresee their ultimate blessedness (vi. 49-76 = Bensly, 75-101). But on the day of judgment each receives what he has deserved; and no one, by interceding for him, can alter the fate of another (vi. 77-83 = Bensly, 102-105).²⁶ Ezra's objection, that surely the Scriptures speak of the righteous having often interceded in behalf of the ungodly, is dismissed with the remark on the part of the angel, that what might avail for this world will not do so for eternity

²⁵ What follows (vi. 1-83) is not found in the majority of the manuscripts of the Latin version, and can only have been borrowed at some former period from the Oriental manuscripts and inserted here. Fritzsche gives the fragment according to the Syriac version, though retaining the numbering of the chapters and verses usually followed in the Ethiopic one. Since 1875 and 1877 we have been made acquainted with the Latin text through two manuscripts (see below). I give above both the numbering of the verses adopted by Fritzsche and that followed by Bensly in his edition of the Latin text.

²⁶ At this point the Latin Vulgate text comes in again.

as well (vii. 36-45). When Ezra is deploring that the whole ruin of the human race has been brought about by Adam, the angel refers him to the impiety of men through which they have become the authors of their own ruin (vii. 46-69). Then follow further explanations, having reference to the circumstance that of the many that are created so very few are saved (viii. 1-62). Finally, the signs of the last time are unfolded to Ezra anew (viii. 63-ix. 13), and his anxiety at the thought of so many being lost is once more set at rest (ix. 14-25). *Fourth vision* (ix. 26-x. 60): While Ezra is again indulging his complaints, he sees a woman on his right hand weeping, and who, in answer to his questions, tells him that after thirty years of barrenness she gave birth to a son, brought him up with great difficulty, and then procured a wife for him, but that just as he was entering the bride-chamber he fell and was killed (ix. 26-x. 4). Ezra chides her for bewailing the mere loss of a son, when she ought rather to be weeping over the destruction of Jerusalem and the ruin of so many men (x. 5-24). Then all at once her face is lifted up, she utters a cry, the earth quakes, and instead of the woman there appears a strongly built city. At this sight Ezra is so perplexed that he cries to the angel Uriel, who at once appears and gives him the following explanation of what he had just seen: The woman is Zion. The thirty years of barrenness are the 3000 years during which no sacrifices had as yet been offered on Zion. The birth of the son represents the building of the temple by Solomon, and the instituting of sacrificial worship on Zion. The death of the son refers to the destruction of Jerusalem. But the newly built city was shown to Ezra in the vision with the view of comforting him, and of saving him from despair (x. 25-60). *Fifth vision* (xi. 1-xii. 51): In a dream Ezra sees an eagle rise out of the sea, having *twelve wings* and *three heads*. And out of the wings grew *eight subordinate wings*, which became small and feeble winglets. But the heads were resting, and the centre one was larger than the others. And the eagle flew and

ruled over the land. And from within its body there issued a voice which ordered the wings to rule one after another. And the twelve wings ruled, one after the other (the second more than twice as long as any of the others, xi. 17), and then vanished, and similarly two of the winglets, so that at last only the three heads and the six winglets were left. Two of those winglets separated themselves from the rest, and placed themselves under the head on the right-hand side. The other four wanted to rule, but two of them soon vanished and the two were consumed by the heads. And the middle head ruled over the whole earth and then vanished. And the two other heads also ruled. But the one on the right-hand side devoured the one on the left (xi. 1-35). Then Ezra sees a lion, and hears how, with a human voice, it describes the eagle just referred to as being the fourth of those animals to which God has in succession committed the empire of the world. And the lion announces to the eagle its impending destruction (xi. 36-46). Thereupon the only remaining head also vanished. And the two winglets which had joined themselves to it began to rule.⁸⁷ But their rule was of a feeble character. And the whole body of the eagle was consumed with fire (xii. 1-3). The meaning of the vision which Ezra rehearses is as follows. The eagle represents the last of Daniel's kingdoms. The twelve wings are twelve kings who are to rule over it, one after another. The second will begin to reign, and will reign longer than the others. The voice which issues from the body of the eagle means that in the course of the duration of that kingdom (*inter tempus regni illius*, as we ought to read with the Syriac and the other Oriental versions) evil disorders will arise; and it will be involved in great trouble, only it will not fall, but regain its power. But the eight subordinate wings represent eight kings, whose respective times will be of short duration. Two of these will

⁸⁷ Here the correct text is that presented by the Oriental versions. See Hilgenfeld and Fritzsche (in answer to Volkmar, who adheres to the corrupt L.A. of the Latin version).

perish when the intermediate time approaches (*appropinquante tempore medio*, i.e. that interregnum to which reference had just been made). Four of them will be reserved for the time when the end is approaching, and two for the time of the end itself. But the meaning of the three heads is as follows. At the time of the end the Most High will raise up three kings,²⁸ who will rule over the earth. And they will cause impiety to reach a climax, and will bring about the end. The one (=the middle head) will die in his bed, but in the midst of torment. Of the remaining two one will be cut off by the sword of the other, while the latter will himself fall by the sword at the time of the end. Finally, the two subordinate wings, which joined the head on the right, represent the two remaining kings of the closing period, whose reign will be feeble and full of disorder (xii. 4–30). But the lion which announces to the eagle its impending destruction represents the Messiah, whom the Most High has reserved for the end. He will arraign them (the kings?) while yet alive before His tribunal, and convict them of their wickedness, and then destroy them. But the people of God He will cause to rejoice (during 400 years, as was foretold in the third vision) till the day of judgment comes (xii. 31–34). After receiving those revelations Ezra is commissioned to write what he had seen in a book, and preserve it in a secret place (xii. 35–51).—*Sixth vision* (xiii. 1–58): Once more he sees in a dream a man rising up out of the sea. And an innumerable company of men gathered themselves together for the purpose of warring against that man. And when they marched out against him, he emitted a fiery breath and flames from his mouth, so that they were all burnt up. Thereupon other men advanced toward him, some of them joyfully, others in sadness, and some again in fetters (xiii. 1–13). In answer to Ezra's request this vision is explained to him as follows. The man who rises out of the sea is he by whom God will redeem His whole creation. He will annihilate his enemies, not with the spear

²⁸ So the Oriental versions. The Latin has *tria regna*.

or implements of war, but by means of the law, which is like unto fire. But the peaceful crowd that advances towards him is the ten tribes returning from the captivity (xiii. 14–58).—*Seventh vision* (xiv. 1–50): Ezra is commissioned by God to instruct the people and set his house in order and withdraw from mortal things, for he is about to be taken from the earth. Moreover, he is to take to himself five men who, during a period of forty days, are to write down what they are told to write. And Ezra did so. And the men wrote what they did not understand. Thereupon Ezra was carried away and conveyed to the place appointed for such as he (xiv. 1–50).

For anything at all decisive with regard to the *date of the composition* of this remarkable book, we are chiefly indebted to the interpretation of the vision of the eagle. For the data furnished by the other passages that have been brought to bear upon this point are of too uncertain a character to be of much service. For example in chap. vi. 9 it is stated that the present world is to end with the rule of Edom, while the world to come is to begin with the supremacy of Israel (*finis enim hujus saeculi Esau, et principium sequentis Jacob*). But it is open to question whether by Edom it is the Herodians (so Hilgenfeld, Volkmar) or whether it is the Romans (so Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. vol. ix. p. 430, 2nd ed. vol. ix. p. 660; Ewald, *Excursus*, p. 198; Langen, p. 125 sq.) that are meant. The latter is no doubt the correct view of the matter.²⁹ But even if the former were to be preferred, very little after all would be gained considering the long period embraced by the Herodian dynasty (down till the year 100 of our era). Then as for the calculation of the

²⁹ In Rabbinical literature Edom is quite a common designation for Rome; see Buxtorf's *Lexicon Chaldaicum*, col. 29 sqq. Otho, *Lex Rabb.* under "Roma." Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* i. 29. Grünbaum, *Zeitschr. der DMG* xxxi. pp. 305–309. Weber, *System der altsynag. paläst. Theol.* p. 348 and elsewhere. This designation occurs so early as in the *Sifre* (see Weber, p. 60). Comp. further Jerome's *Comment. ad Jesaj.* xxi. 11, 12 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, iv. 217): *Quidam Hebraeorum pro Duma Romam legunt, volentes prophetiam contra regnum Romanum dirigi, frivola persuasione qua semper in Idumaeae nomine Romanos existimant demonstrari.*

world-periods as given in chap. xiv. 11, 12 (*Duodecim enim partibus divisum est saeculum, et transierunt ejus decimam et dimidium decimae partis, superant autem ejus duae post medium decimae partis*). The mere fact of the reading fluctuating so much here (in the Syriac and Armenian versions the passage does not occur at all) should of itself have been enough to deter any one from attempting any calculation whatever of these world-periods. It will be seen then that, apart from the general purport of the book, it is the *vision of the eagle* alone that can be said to furnish a clue to the date of its composition. In the interpretation of this vision the *following points*, which naturally present themselves on a general survey of the contents, are *to be kept steadily in view*: the twelve principal wings, the eight subordinate ones, and the three heads represent twenty-three sovereigns or rulers who reign one after the other, and that in the following order. First we have the twelve principal wings and two of the subordinate ones. Then comes a time of disorder. At the expiry of this period four subordinate wings have their turn, and after them the three heads. During the reign of the third head the Messiah appears, upon which follows the overthrow of the third head and the short feeble reign of the two remaining subordinate wings. We thus see that, from the author's standpoint, both the overthrow of the third head and the reign of the last two subordinate wings were still in the future; from which it follows that he must have written during the reign of the third head, and that the reign of the two last subordinate wings is not matter of history, but exists only in the author's imagination. Further, the following points are to be specially noted: (1) The second principal wing reigns more than twice as long as any of the rest (xi. 17). (2) Many of the wings, particularly of the subordinate wings, come upon the scene without actually getting the length of reigning, and therefore represent mere pretenders and usurpers. (3) All the rulers belong to *one and the same* kingdom, and are, or at least aim at being, the rulers of the

whole of that kingdom. (4) The first dies a natural death (xii. 26), the second is murdered by the third (xi. 35, xii. 28). Now, with the help of this exegetical result, let us test the various *interpretations that have been attempted*, and which we may divide into three leading groups, according as the eagle has been supposed to refer either (1) to Rome under the monarchy and the republic, or (2) to the Greek rule, or (3) to Rome under the emperors.

1. Laurence, van der Vlis and Lücke (2nd ed.) understand the vision of the eagle as referring to the history of Rome from the time of Romulus till that of Caesar. Those three writers are all agreed in this, that the three heads represent *Sulla*, *Pompey* and *Caesar*, and that our book was composed in the time of Caesar (Lücke), or shortly after his assassination (van der Vlis), or a little later still (Laurence). No doubt the interpretation 12+8 wings is beset with considerable difficulty, but this is supposed to be got over by falling back upon those persons who at a later period aspired to the throne, and upon the party leaders in the time of the civil wars. But even if this were not a somewhat doubtful proceeding, there are still two considerations that could not fail to prove fatal to this view: first, the fact that for a Jewish apocalyptic writer the whole period previous to the time of Pompey would have simply no interest whatever; and then this other fact, that if Rome is to be thought of at all, the reference can only be to a time when she was mistress of the world. For the whole of the wings and heads are intended to represent rulers who exercised or at all events aspired to exercise sway over the entire world.

2. Hilgenfeld supposes the vision to have reference to the Greek rule. It is true that previously (*Apokalyptik*, pp. 217-221) he took the 12+8 wings to mean the *Ptolemies*. The twelve wings and the first two of the subordinate wings he made out to be the following:—(1) Alexander the Great, (2) Ptolemy I. Lagi, (3-8) Ptolemy II. to Ptolemy VII., (9) Cleopatra I., (10-14) Ptolemy VIII. Lathyrus to Ptolemy

XII. Auletes. The other six subordinate wings were supposed to refer to the offshoots from the Ptolemaic dynasty down to Cleopatra the younger († 30 B.C.). Then some time after (*Zeitschr.* 1860, pp. 335–358) he substituted the *Seleucidae* for the Ptolemies, and reckoned the kings from Alexander the Great on to the descendants of Seleucus. But still he always adhered strictly to the view, that the three heads were to be taken as referring to *Caesar*, *Antony* and *Octavian*, and that the book must have been composed immediately after Antony's death in the year 30 B.C. (*Zeitschr.* 1867, p. 285: "exactly 30 years before Christ"). Although this interpretation enables us more easily to find room for the twenty kings than the foregoing one, still it can hardly be said to be a bit more tenable. One great objection to it above all is this, that while it supposes the twenty wings to refer to Greek rulers, it regards the three heads, on the other hand, as referring to *Roman* rulers, whereas the text obviously requires us to regard the whole as rulers of one and the same kingdom. But Hilgenfeld's interpretation is incompatible above all with the statement that the second wing was to rule twice as long as any of the others (xi. 17). For this will suit neither the case of Ptolemy I. nor that of Seleucus I. Nicator. Hilgenfeld too has fully realized the awkwardness of this passage, and while at one time he was disposed to look upon it as an interpolation, he has more recently had recourse to the expedient of supposing that, in the statement in question, the author had in view only the first six wings, namely those on the right side, on which assumption he finds that the notice exactly suits the case of Seleucus I. (*Zeitschr.* 1867, p. 286 sq., 1870, p. 310 sq.). But the text does not in the least degree sanction such a limitation as this (*nemo post te tenebit tempus tuum, sed nec dimidium ejus*). There is a further contradiction of the text in the referring of the first head to *Caesar*, who, as is well known, was assassinated, whereas, according to chap. xii. 26, the ruler in question was to die *super lectum*. But let us say generally that every interpretation is to be

regarded as untenable which proceeds on the assumption that the book was written earlier than the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. One of the principal objects of the book is just this, to comfort the people on the occasion of the destruction in question. Ezra over and over again prays to have an explanation of the mystery of Jerusalem's lying low in the dust while the Gentile nations exult in triumph. It is with regard to this that, through the medium of a divine revelation, he obtains instruction and comfort. Now to write a work of this nature could hardly be supposed to have any meaning or object whatsoever except at a time when Jerusalem was actually lying in ruins. No doubt it is the first destruction of the city (by Nebuchadnezzar) that is in view. But as it is of course impossible that the book can have been written in the decades immediately following this event (if for nothing but chap. xi. 39, xii. 11, where Daniel is presupposed), the only course open to us is to come down to a date subsequent to the destruction by Titus, and to assume that the author intended that first destruction by Nebuchadnezzar to be regarded as, so to speak, a type of the second, and that the consolations purporting to have been communicated to Ezra were in reality meant for that generation in whose minds the recollection of the destruction of the year 70 was still fresh; although for the pseudo-Ezra this event was perhaps more a thing of the past than it was for the pseudo-Baruch. Then a distinct allusion to the destruction of the city by the Romans may also be found in the words which the lion addresses to the eagle (xi. 42): *Destruxisti habitationes eorum qui fructificabant et humiliasti muros eorum qui te non nocuerunt.* Consequently there cannot be a doubt that—

3. Corrodi, Lücke (1st ed.), Gfrörer, Dillmann, Volkmar, Ewald, Langen, Wieseler, Keil, Hausrath, Renan, Drummond, Reuss, Gutschmid, Le Hir are correct in holding that the eagle is to be understood as representing imperial Rome. They are all at one in this, that the line of rulers should begin with *Caesar*, and that, by the second wing, the duration of

whose reign was more than twice as long as that of any of the others (xi. 17), it is *Augustus* that is meant. This point may in fact be regarded as settled. For the placing of Cæsar as the first in the line of Roman emperors is also to be met with elsewhere (Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 2. 2, 6. 10 ; *Orac. Sibyll.* v. 10–15. Comp. Volkmar, p. 344). Moreover the length of time during which Augustus reigned is estimated, as a rule, at 56 years, counting from his first consulate in the year 711 A.U.C.=43 B.C. (see Volkmar, p. 344 ; Gutschmid, *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 37). According to this calculation the actual duration of the reign of Augustus is found to have been more than twice longer than that of all the other Roman emperors belonging to the first three centuries.

But there is one point in regard to which there is an essential difference between Gutschmid and Le Hir on the one hand and all the other writers mentioned above on the other. For while Corrodi (i. 208) and the others understand the three heads as referring to the three Flavian emperors (Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian), and accordingly regard the book as having been written during the last decades of the first century of our era, Gutschmid interprets as follows:—He takes the twelve principal wings to represent : (1) Caesar, (2) Augustus, (3) Tiberius, (4) Caligula, (5) Claudius, (6) Nero, (7) Vespasian, (8) Domitian, (9) Trajan, (10) Hadrian, (11) Antoninus Pius, (12) Marcus Aurelius. The first two of the subordinate wings he supposes to refer to Titus and Nerva, and the four immediately following them to : (1) Commodus, (2) Pertinax, (3) Didius Julianus, and (4) Pescennius Niger. The three heads again he takes to represent, *Septimius Severus* (193–211 A.D.) with his two sons *Caracalla* and *Geta*. Geta was murdered by Caracalla, but this latter also fell by the sword (217 A.D.). The last two of the subordinate wings he supposes to be intended for Macrinus and his son Diadumenianus, who were assassinated in the year 218 A.D. He thinks therefore that the vision of the eagle must have been written immediately before, in the month of June 218

(*Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 48). Moreover Gutschmid regards the vision of the eagle as a later interpolation, while he thinks—and here he is more in accord with Hilgenfeld—that the main body of the book must have been written in the year 31 B.C. Le Hir, in *his* interpretation of the vision now in question, coincides with Gutschmid in almost every particular (*Etudes Bibliques*, i. pp. 184–192). The only point in which they differ is this, that Le Hir, founding upon the list of emperors given by Clement of Alexandria, counts the reign of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus as simply one, thus including the latter among those represented by the principal wings, while, to make up for this, he inserts Clodius Albinus after Pescennius Niger among those represented by the subordinate wings. Nor does he think that the entire book was written in the year 218 A.D., but is of opinion that there was in the first instance a Jewish original, and subsequently a Christian revision and modification of this latter. He holds that the former, which is already made use of in the Epistle of Barnabas, was written in the last quarter of the first century of our era, while the Christian revision, in which the vision of the eagle was inserted, would be composed in the year 218 A.D. (*Etudes Bibliques*, i. p. 207 sq.).

The tempting thing about this interpretation is, that it enables us actually to specify all the rulers represented by the 12 + 8 wings, which, if we suppose the Flavian period to be in view, it is impossible to do. But, for all that, it is unquestionably erroneous. It is precluded above all by the circumstance that the book is already quoted by Clement of Alexandria. Consequently it must have been in existence toward the close of the second century. No doubt Gutschmid and Le Hir are disposed to fall back upon the hypothesis of interpolation or of revision and modification. But the book itself furnishes neither occasion nor justification for such a hypothesis. The vision of the eagle fits in admirably, and could scarcely be omitted without completely mutilating the work. The hypothesis of interpolation is therefore gratuitous

in the extreme, to say nothing of the fact that it is incompatible with many points of detail. For example Galba, Otho and Vitellius are completely left out of account. Commodus is classed by Gutschmid with those who are represented by the subordinate wings, while Le Hir counts his reign and that of Marcus Aurelius as constituting simply one reign, all which is extremely forced. But the most awkward thing of all is, that the two subordinate wings, Titus and Nerva, did not reign, as the text however requires us to suppose (xii. 21), *appropinquante tempore medio*, i.e. shortly before the interregnum, before the period of disorder, but in the heart of the peaceful rule of the principal wings.³⁰

Consequently if we are to adopt the ordinary interpretation we will have to stop at the Flavian period. There can be no mistaking the fact that all that is said with regard to *the three heads* will apply admirably to the three Flavian emperors, Vespasian, Titus and Domitian. Those who had brought about the destruction of the holy city really constituted for the Jew the acme of power and ungodliness. Vespasian died, as we are told xii. 26, *super lectum et tamen cum tormentis* (comp. Sueton. *Vesp.* xxiv. Dio Cass. lxvi. 17). It is true Titus was not murdered by Domitian as is presupposed in chaps. xi. 35, xii. 28. Yet it was currently believed that this was the case, and certainly Domitian's demeanour at the time of his brother's death gave ample occasion for such a belief (Sueton. *Domitian II.* Dio Cass. lxvi. 26; *Orac. Sibyll.* xii. 120-123. Aurelius Victor, *Caesar*, x. and xi., states explicitly that Titus had been poisoned by Domitian). This likewise corresponds with the actual fact that several of the subordinate wings, i.e. of the usurpers, had been disposed of with the help of the other two heads. But after all, the finding of a place for the whole 12+8 wings is not a matter of insuperable difficulty. The twelve principal wings may be regarded as representing say the following rulers:—(1) Caesar, (2) Augustus, (3) Tiberius, (4) Caligula, (5) Claudius, (6) Nero, (7) Galba,

³⁰ In answer to Gutschmid, see also Volkmar, p. 389 sq.

(8) Otho, (9) Vitellius, to whom may be added the three usurpers: (10) Vindex, (11) Nymphidius, (12) Piso. But what is to be made of the eight subordinate wings? To dispose of them Volkmar and Ewald have had recourse to expedients of the most singular kind. Volkmar, who is followed by Renan, makes out the number of rulers to be not $12 + 8$, but, by taking the wings as pairs, only $6 + 4$. The six rulers he takes to be the Julian emperors from Caesar to Nero; the four again he takes to be: Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and Nerva. So Volkmar and Renan, and that although we are plainly told in chap. xii. 14 that: *Regnabunt autem in ea reges duodecim, unus post unum*; and in ver. 20 of the same chapter find the words: *exsurgent enim in ipso octo reges*. Ewald again goes the length of thinking that not only the eight subordinate wings, but also the three heads, are to be regarded as included among the twelve principal wings, and consequently that the three groups of rulers are to be identified, and that we should reckon only twelve rulers altogether (counting from Caesar to Domitian). The most obvious exegetical principles should have been sufficient to prevent any such attempts at explanation as we have here. Nor can Langen be said to have altogether eschewed this arbitrary style of criticism when he inclines, as he does, to take the numbers merely as round numbers, and to regard the twelve principal wings as intended to represent the six Julian emperors. For the text undoubtedly requires us to assume that there were $12 + 8$ rulers, or at all events pretenders. No less untenable is the view of Gfrörer (i. 90 sq.), who refers the eight subordinate wings partly to Herod and some of his descendants, partly to Jewish (!) agitators, as John of Gischala and Simon Bar-Giora; or that of Wieseler, who thinks that the whole eight subordinate wings are meant to represent the Herodian dynasty alone. In point of fact however the only distinction between the subordinate and the principal wings is this, that in the case of the former the reign is short and feeble (xii. 20), or they fail ever to get the

length of reigning at all (xi. 25-27). As for the rest they are, quite as much as the principal wings, rulers of the entire empire, or at all events aspire to be so. Consequently it is impossible to suppose that it is vassal princes that are represented by those subordinate wings; rather must we hold, with Corrodi (*Gesch. des Chiliasmus*, i. 207), that it is "governors, rival candidates for the throne, and rebels," or with Dillmann (Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. vol. xii. p. 312), that it is "Roman generals and pretenders" that are in view. Of course we have had to avail ourselves of the better known among the usurpers in order to complete the number twelve. But it would appear that the author reckons along with them all those Roman generals who, during the period of disorder (68-70), had at any time put forward claims to the throne. And of these surely it would not be difficult to make out six. For it is only a question of six, seeing that, as has been already noticed, the last two of the subordinate wings do not represent actual historical personages.

If the view which represents the three heads as referring to the Flavian emperors be correct, it should not be difficult to determine the date of the composition of our book. We have already seen that the author wrote during the reign of the third head, inasmuch as he is already acquainted with the manner in which the second was put to death, while on the other hand he is looking forward to the overthrow of the third after the Messiah has made His appearance. Consequently the composition of the book is not, with Corrodi and Ewald, to be referred to so early a date as the time of Titus, nor again, with Volkmar, Langen, Hausrath and Renan, to one so late as the time of Nerva, but, with Gfrörer, Dillmann, Wieseler and Reuss, to the reign of Domitian (81-96 A.D.).

The designation *Fourth Book of Ezra*, under which our work is known, is current only in the Latin Church, and is to be traced to the fact that the canonical books Ezra and Nehemiah were reckoned as First and Second Ezra respectively, while the Ezra of the Greek Bible was regarded as Third Ezra (so Jerome, *Praef. in version. libr. Ezrae*, Opp. ed. Vallarsi, ix. 1524: Nec

quemquam moveat, quod unus a nobis editus liber est; nec apocryphorum tertii et quarti somniis delectetur). This mode of designating those different books has also been retained in the official Roman Vulgate, where Third and Fourth Ezra are inserted at the end of the New Testament. In the manuscript of Amiens, from which Bensly edited the Latin fragment, the canonical books Ezra and Nehemiah taken together are regarded as First Ezra, the so-called Third Ezra is counted as Second Ezra, while Fourth Ezra is divided into three books, chaps. i.-ii. being counted as Third Ezra, chaps. iii.-xiv. as Fourth Ezra, and chaps. xv., xvi. as Fifth Ezra (Bensly, *The Missing Fragment*, p. 6). Similarly, though with greater complication still, in the *Codex Sangermanensis* and the manuscripts derived from it (Bensly, p. 85 sq.). The earliest designation seems to have been "Εσδρας ὁ προφήτης (Clemens Alex. *Strom.* iii. 16. 100) or "Εσδρα ἀποκάλυψις, for it is doubtless our Fourth Book of Ezra that is meant by the apocryphal work bearing that name which occurs in the list of the Apocrypha edited by Montfaucon, Cotelier, Hody and Pitra (see p. 126). For more on the different titles, see Volkmar, *Das vierte Buch Esra*, p. 3. Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum*, pp. xviii.-xxi.

Use and high repute of the book in the Christian Church.—It is probable that it is this work that is referred to in the following passage in the Epistle of Barnabas, chap. xii.: 'Ομοίως πάλιν περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ὀρίζει ἐν ἄλλῃ προφῆτῃ λέγοντι· Καὶ τότε ταῦτα συντελεσθήσεται; λέγει κύριος· "Όταν ξύλον κλιθῇ καὶ ἀναστῇ, καὶ ὅταν ἐκ ξύλου αἷμα στάξῃ. Comp. Fourth Ezra, iv. 33: Quomodo et quando haec? . . . v. 5: Si de ligno sanguis stillabit. It is true that here the first half of the quotation is wanting, but for all that Le Moyne and Fabricius (*Cod. pseudepigr.* ii. 184) were undoubtedly correct in tracing it to Fourth Ezra. Comp. further, Cotelier, Hilgenfeld and Harnack in their editions of the Epistle of Barnabas; Hilgenfeld, *Die apostol. Väter*, p. 47. It is also extremely probable that we are indebted to Fourth Ezra for the legend to the effect that, when the *Holy Scriptures* had perished on the occasion of the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, *Ezra completely restored them again by means of a miracle*. So Irenaeus, iii. 21. 2. Tertullian, *De cultu femin.* i. 3. Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 22. 149. Comp. Fourth Ezra xiv. 18-22 and 37-47. Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr.* i. 1156-1160. Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum*, p. 107. Strack in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vol. vii. 414 sq. (art. "Kanon des A. T.'s").

The first express quotation occurs in Clemens Alex. *Strom.* iii. 16. 100: Διὰ τί γὰρ οὐκ ἐγένετο ἡ μήτρα τῆς μητρός μου τάφος, ἵνα μὴ ἴδω τὸν μόχθον τοῦ Ἰακώβ καὶ τὸν κόπον τοῦ γένους Ἰσραὴλ; "Εσδρας ὁ προφήτης λέγει. Comp. 4 Ezra v. 35. Our book is repeatedly used and quoted as prophetic, above all by Ambrose. See the passages in Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* ii. pp. 183, 185 sqq. Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum*, p. xxii. sq. Le Hir, *Etudes Bibliques*, i. 142. Bensly, *The Missing Fragment*, pp. 74-76. It is also quoted as *propheta Esdras* in the so-called *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* printed among Chrysostom's works (ed. Montfaucon, vol. vi.), *Homil.* xxxiv. s. fin. Jerome, who maintains a critical attitude toward the Apocrypha generally, is the only one who expresses himself unfavourably. See the passage quoted above from the *Praef. in version. libr. Ezrae*,

and especially *Adv. Vigilantium*, chap. vi. (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ii. 393): Tu vigilans dormis et dormiens scribis et proponis mihi librum apocryphum, qui sub nomine Esdrae a te et similibus tui legitur, ubi scriptum est, quod post mortem nullus pro aliis audeat deprecari, quem ego librum numquam legi. Quid enim necesse est in manus sumere, quod ecclesia non recepit. But although our book continued to be excluded from the canon, it nevertheless enjoyed a wide circulation, especially in the Middle Ages. Bensly has proved by actual verification that it finds a place in more than sixty Latin manuscripts of the Bible (Bensly, *The Missing Fragment*, pp. 42, 82 sqq.), and this without taking into account scarcely any of the Italian libraries. As we have already mentioned, it appears in the official Vulgate as an appendix. It also finds a place in not a few German editions of the Bible, Lutheran and Reformed as well as Catholic (for the evidence in regard to this, see Gildemeister, *Esdrae liber quartus arabice*, 1877, p. 42). On the history of the use, comp. further, Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr.* ii. 174–192. Idem, *Cod. apocryph. Nov. Test.* i. 936–938. Volkmar, *Das vierte Buch Ezra*, p. 273 sq. Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum*, pp. xviii.–xxiv., lxix. sq.

Care must be taken not to confound the Fourth Book of Ezra with the Christian work entitled the *Apocalypse of Ezra* which Tischendorf has edited (*Apocalypses apocryphae*, Lips. 1866, pp. 24–33). On this comp. Tischendorf, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1851, p. 423 sqq. Idem, *Prolegom.* to his edition, pp. 12–14. Le Hir, *Etudes Bibliques* (Paris 1869), ii. 120–122. By the Ἑσδρα ἀποκάλυψις, which occurs in the list of the Apocrypha edited by Montfaucon, Pitra and others, it is possibly the Fourth Book of Ezra that is meant (see p. 126). On the Ezra-Apocrypha, comp. also Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* i. 1162. On the later additions to the *Fourth Book of Ezra* (chaps. i.–ii. and xv. xvi.), which in the manuscripts appear as yet as separate Books of Ezra, and which came for the first time to be blended with the main work in the printed text, see Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vol. xii. 356, and Bensly, *The Missing Fragment*, pp. 35–40.

The texts of the Fourth Book of Ezra that have come down to us are the following:—

(1.) The old *Latin version*, which is the most literal, and therefore the most important of all. The vulgar text, as it had long been printed, was extremely inaccurate. In the edition of Fabricius (*Codex pseudepigraphus Vet. Test.* vol. ii. 1723, pp. 173–307) the Arabic version, which was given to the public through Ockley's English translation in 1711, was collated throughout with the Latin text. Sabatier was the first to lay the foundation for the critical restoration of the text by his publication of the variants of the important *Codex Sangermanensis* (Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. iii. 1743, pp. 1038, 1069–1084). Numerous emendations based upon the *Codex Sangermanensis*, and the Ethiopic version published by Laurence in 1820, were proposed by Van der Vlis (*Disputatio critica de Ezrae libro apocrypho vulgo quarto dicto*, Amstelod. 1839). The first critical edition was published by Volkmar (*Handbuch der Einleitung in die Apocryphen*, second part: *Das vierte Buch Ezra*, Tüb. 1863). In this edition Sabatier's collation of the *Cod. Sangermanensis* and a Zürich manu-

script collated by Volkmar himself were made use of. These manuscripts however were not collated with sufficient care, as the subsequent editions of Hilgenfeld (*Messias Judaeorum*, Lips. 1869) and Fritzsche (*Libri apocryphi Vet. Test. graece*, Lips. 1871) have shown. Both these writers give the Latin text according to three different manuscripts: (a) the *Cod. Sangermanensis saec. ix.*, collated anew for Hilgenfeld's edition by Zotenberg; (b) the *Cod. Turicensis saec. xiii.*, also collated anew for Hilgenfeld's edition by Fritzsche; (c) a *Cod. Dresdensis saec. xv.*, collated by Hilgenfeld. In the whole of those editions a considerable fragment is wanting between chaps. vii. 35 and vii. 36, which could only be supplied from the Oriental versions. This fragment was first discovered, so far as the Latin text is concerned, by Bensly in a manuscript at Amiens (formerly at Corbie near Amiens) in the year 1875 (Bensly, *The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation of the Fourth Book of Ezra*, discovered and edited with an Introduction and Notes, Cambridge 1875. *Comp. Theol. Literaturztg.* 1876, p. 43 sq.). After this it was also published by Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1876, pp. 421-435). Two years after this again the same fragment was edited from a *Madrid* manuscript (formerly in Alcalá de Henares) by Wood, and from among the remains of John Palmer the Orientalist († 1840), who had transcribed it as early as the year 1826 (*Journal of Philology*, vol. vii. 1877, pp. 264-278). Besides the manuscripts hitherto mentioned, Bensly (pp. 42, 82 sqq.) has verified some *sixty others of the Latin text*.⁸¹ Those of them in which there is the large hiatus in chap. vii., and this holds true of probably the whole of them, at all events of the *Turicensis* and the *Dresdensis*, as also of the printed vulgar text, are of no value, for the hiatus in the *Cod. Sangermanensis* was due to the cutting out of a leaf, so that all the manuscripts and texts in which precisely the same hiatus occurs must have followed that codex (as from a letter addressed to Bensly, Gildemeister appears to have already noted in the year 1865). Consequently in the case of any future edition consideration will be due, in the first instance, only to: (a) the *Cod. Sangermanensis* (now in Paris), dating from the year 822 A.D. (Bensly, p. 5); (b) the *Amiens* manuscript, also belonging to the ninth century, and independent of the *Cod. Sanger.*; and (c) the *Madrid* manuscript. At the same time we may observe that the *Latin manuscripts of the Bible in the majority of the Italian libraries have not yet been examined in connection with our book*.

(2.) Next to the Latin the best and most trustworthy version is the Syriac, which has been transmitted to us in the large Peshito manuscript of Milan (*Cod. Ambros. B. 21, Inf.*). It was published for the first time by Ceriani first of all in a Latin version (Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et profana*, vol. i. fasc. 2, Mediol. 1866, pp. 99-124), then in the Syriac text itself (Ceriani, *Mon. sac. et prof.* vol. v. fasc. 1, Mediol. 1868, pp. 4-111). This latter is also given in the photo-lithographed facsimile of the whole manuscript (*Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex cod. Ambr. photo-lithographice*, ed. Ceriani, 2 vols. in 4 parts, Milan 1876-1883; comp. vol.

⁸¹ On two Parisian and two Berlin manuscripts, see Gildemeister, *Esdrae liber quartus Arabice*, 1877, p. 44 *fin.*

iii. p. 92). Hilgenfeld has embodied Ceriani's Latin version in his *Messias Judaeorum* (Lips. 1869).

(3.) The Ethiopic version, which is also of importance for the reconstruction of the original text. It had been previously published by Laurence, accompanied with a Latin and English version, but only from a single manuscript, and not quite free from errors (Laurence, *Primi Ezrae libri, qui apud Vulgatam appellatur quartus, versio Aethiopica, nunc primo in medium prolata et Latine Angliceque reddita*, Oxoniae et Londoni 1820). Numerous corrections have been made by van der Vlis (*Disputatio critica de Ezrae libro apocrypho vulgo quarto dicto*, Amst. 1839). A collection of the variants in the other manuscripts has been furnished by Dillmann in the appendix to Ewald's dissertation in the *Abhandlungen der Göttinger Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* vol. xi. 1862-1863. Then, in the last place, Prätorius, availing himself of Dillmann's collection of variants, and also collating with a Berlin manuscript, has made various emendations in the Latin version which Hilgenfeld has embodied in his *Messias Judaeorum* (Lips. 1869). A critical edition is still a desideratum. Among the Ethiopic manuscripts of the so-called Magdala collection, which some years ago were forwarded to the British Museum at the close of the war between the English and King John of Abyssinia, there happen to be no fewer than eight of our book (see Wright's catalogue in the *Zeitschr. der DMG.* 1870, p. 599 sqq., Nos. 5, 10, 11, 13, 23, 24, 25, 27. Bensly, *The Missing Fragment*, p. 2, note 3).

(4.) The two Arabic versions are of but secondary importance, owing to the great freedom in which their authors often indulge. (a) One of them, which is in a manuscript in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, was in the first instance published only in an English version by Ockley (in Whitson's *Primitive Christianity revived*, vol. iv. London 1711). Ewald was the first to publish the Arabic text (*Transactions of the Göttingen Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* vol. xi. 1862-1863). Emendations upon Ockley's version and Ewald's text were furnished by Steiner (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1868, pp. 426-433), with whose assistance Hilgenfeld also composed a Latin rendering for his *Messias Judaeorum* (Lips. 1869). The Arabic version here in question is also found in a Codex Vaticanus, which, though merely a transcript of the one in the Bodleian library, is nevertheless of some value in so far as it was copied before the leaf, which is at present wanting in the Bodleian codex, went amissing (Bensly, *The Missing Fragment*, p. 77 sq. Gildemeister, *Esdrae liber quartus*, p. 3; this latter supplies at pp. 6-8 the text of this fragment, which is omitted in Ewald's edition). (b) An extract from another Arabic version is likewise found in a Bodleian codex, from which it has been edited by Ewald (as above). A German version of this extract was furnished by Steiner (*Zeitschr. f. wissenschaft. Theol.* 1868, pp. 396-425). On the extract itself, comp. further, Ewald, *Transactions of the Göttingen Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* 1863, pp. 163-180. The complete text of this version was published by Gildemeister in Arabic and Latin from a Codex Vaticanus (*Esdrae liber quartus arabice, e codice Vaticano nunc primum edidit*, Bonnae 1877).

(5.) The Armenian version, which is still freer than the Arabic one, and

is of but little service for the restoration of the original text. It was published as early as the year 1805 in the edition of the Armenian Bible issued under the superintendence of the Mechitarists, but Ceriani was the first to rescue it from oblivion, while Ewald again furnished specimens of it in a German rendering (*Transactions of the Göttingen Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* 1865, pp. 504–516). A Latin version, prepared by Petermann and based upon a collation of four manuscripts, is given in Hilgenfeld's *Messias Judaeorum* (Lips. 1869). In the older editions of the Armenian Bible (the first dating as far back as 1666) there is an Armenian version of our book which was prepared by the first editor, Uscanus himself, and taken from the Vulgate (see Scholtz, *Einl. in die heiligen Schriften*, vol. i. 1845, p. 501. Gildemeister, *Esdrae liber quartus arabice*, p. 43. This may be made use of for the purpose of correcting Bensly, p. 2, note 2).

German versions of our book have been published by Volkmar (*Das vierte Buch Esra*, 1863) and Ewald (*Transactions of the Göttingen Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* vol. xi. 1862, 1863), while Hilgenfeld attempted a rendering back into the Greek (*Messias Judaeorum*, Lips. 1869).

Critical inquiries. For the earlier literature, see Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr.* ii. 174 sqq. Lücke, *Einl.* p. 187 sqq. Volkmar, *Das vierte Buch Esra* (1863), pp. 273–275, 374 sqq. Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum*, p. liv. sqq. Corrodi (also spelt Corodi), *Kritische Geschichte des Chiasmus*, vol. i. (1781) pp. 179–230. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils* (also under the title, *Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, vols. i., ii.), 1838, i. 69–93. Lücke, *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes* (2nd ed. 1852), pp. 144–212. Bleek, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, pp. 982–990 (review of Lücke's *Einl.*). Noack, *Der Ursprung des Christenthums*, vol. i. (1857) pp. 341–363. Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalyphtik* (1857), pp. 185–242. Idem, *Die Propheten Esra und Daniel*, 1863. Idem, *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theologie*, vol. i. 1858, pp. 250–270; iii. 1860, pp. 335–358; vi. 1863, pp. 229–292, 457 sq.; x. 1867, pp. 87–91, 263–295; xiii. 1870, pp. 308–319; xix. 1876, pp. 421–435. Gutschmid, “Die Apokalypse des Esra und ihre späteren Bearbeitungen” (*Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1860, pp. 1–81). Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. vol. xii. 1860, pp. 310–312; 2nd ed. vol. xii. 1883, pp. 353–356 (art. “Pseudepigraphen”). Volkmar, *Handbuch der Einleitung in die Apokryphen*, second part: *Das vierte Buch Esra*, Tüb. 1863. At a previous date by the same author, *Das vierte Buch Esra und apokalyptische Geheimnisse überhaupt*, Zürich 1858. “Einige Bemerkungen über Apokalyphtik” (*Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1861, pp. 83–92). Ewald, “Das vierte Esrabuch nach seinem Zeitalter, seinen arabischen Uebersetzungen und einer neuen Wiederherstellung” (*Transactions of the Royal Gesellsch. der Wissensch. of Göttingen*, vol. xi. 1862–1863, histor.-philol. section, pp. 133–230. Also as a separate reprint). Idem, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. vii. 3rd ed. 1868, pp. 69–83. Ceriani, “Sul Das vierte Esrabuch del Dottor Enrico Ewald” (*Estratto dalle Memorie del R. Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere*), Milano 1865. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina*, 1866, pp. 112–139. Le Hir, “Du IV.^e livre d'Esdra” (*Etudes Bibliques*, 2 vols. Paris 1869, i. 139–250).

“Das vierte Buch Esra nach Inhalt und Alter untersucht” (*Stud.*

u. Krit. 1870, pp. 263-304). Keil, *Lehrb. der histor.-krit. Einleitung in das kanon. und apokr. Schriften des A. T.* 3rd ed. 1873, pp. 758-764. Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. iv. 80-88 (1st ed. iii. 282-289). Renan, "L'apocalypse de l'an 97" (*Revue des deux Mondes*, 1875, March, pp. 127-144). Idem, *Les évangiles*, 1877, pp. 348-373. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, 1877, pp. 84-117. Reuss, *Gesch. der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), sec. 597.

6. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.*

In the pseudepigraphic prophecies which we have hitherto been considering, revelations and predictions—and therefore the apocalyptic element—chiefly predominated. But just as these revelations themselves had practical objects as their ultimate aim, such objects as the strengthening and comforting of the faithful, so alongside of them there was also another class of works in which the exhortations and encouragements were more directly expressed. We have a pseud-epigraphic prophecy of this description in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, which is chiefly composed of such direct exhortations. This somewhat extensive work has come down to us in its entirety in the Greek text, which was published for the first time by Grabe (1698), although, from the beginning of the sixteenth century, a good many printed copies of a Latin version prepared in the thirteenth by Robert Grossetest, Bishop of Lincoln, had been in circulation.

The book, as we now have it, contains a great many direct allusions to the incarnation of God in Christ, for which reason almost all modern critics look upon it as the production of a Christian author. But it is extremely doubtful whether this is a correct view of the matter, and whether we ought not rather to assume that the work in its original form is of Jewish authorship, and that the passages that are of a Christian character were interpolated at some later date. As is indicated by the title itself, the book consists of the spiritual "testaments" which the twelve sons of Jacob left behind them for their descendants. *In each of those testaments three different elements may be distinguished.* (1) The patriarch in each

instance rehearses in the first place *the history of his own life*, in the course of which he either charges himself with sins he has committed (as is done by the majority of them), or on the other hand boasts of his virtues. The biographical notices follow the lines of the Biblical narrative, although, after the fashion of the Haggadean Midrash, they are enriched with a large number of fresh details. (2) The patriarch then proceeds to address to his descendants a number of *appropriate exhortations* based upon the preceding autobiographical sketch, urging them to beware of the sin that had been the cause of such deep distress to their ancestor, and in the event of his being able to boast of something redounding to his credit, recommending them to imitate his virtuous behaviour. The subject on which the exhortations turn is, as a rule, one that happens to have a very intimate connection with the biographical notices, the patriarch's descendants being warned precisely against that sin or, it may be, to imitate that virtue which had been exemplified in his own life. (3) But besides this, we also find toward the end of each of the testaments (with the exception perhaps of that of Gad, where this point is only briefly hinted at) certain *predictions* regarding the future of the particular tribe in question, the patriarch for example predicting that his descendants would one day apostatize from God or, what sometimes appears to amount to the same thing, sever their connection with the tribes of Levi and Judah, and thereby involve themselves in misery, and especially the evils of captivity and dispersion. This prediction is frequently accompanied with an exhortation to adhere to the tribes of Levi and Judah. On the other hand, these predictions are interspersed with a large number of very direct references to redemption through Christ.

The circles of thought in these "testaments" are of a very heterogeneous character. On the one hand, they contain a great deal that it seems impossible to explain except on the assumption that they were composed by a Jewish author. The history of the patriarchs is amplified precisely in the style

of the Haggadean Midrash. The author assumes that salvation is in store only for the children of Shem, while those of Ham are doomed to destruction (Simeon vi.). He manifests a lively interest in the Jewish tribes as such; he deplores their apostasy and dispersion; he exhorts them to cleave to the tribes of Levi and Judah as being those which God has specially called to be the leaders of the others;⁸² he cherishes the hope of their ultimate conversion and deliverance. It is true, no doubt, that in his positive injunctions he nowhere inculcates the observance of the ceremonial law, such injunctions being more of a moral character throughout nearly the entire book, and consisting for example of warnings against the sins of envy, avarice, anger, lying, incontinency, exhortations to the love of one's neighbour, compassion, integrity, and such like. But at the same time he does not fail to speak of the priestly sacrificial worship, and that even with many details introduced into it not met with in the Old Testament itself, as being an institution of divine appointment.⁸³ On the other hand again we also meet with numerous passages which can only have been written by a Christian, passages which teach the Christian doctrine of the universal character of salvation as well as that of redemption through the incarnation of God, nay in one instance there is a distinct reference to the

⁸² Reuben vi.: Τῷ γὰρ Λευὶ ἔδωκε Κύριος τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τῷ Ἰούδᾳ. Judah xxi.: Καὶ νῦν, τέκνα, ἀγαπήσατε τὸν Λευί, ἵνα διαμείνητε· καὶ μὴ ἐπαίρεσθε ἐπ' αὐτόν, ἵνα μὴ ἐξολοθρευθῆτε. Ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἔδωκε Κύριος τὴν βασιλείαν, καὶ κέλευε τὴν ἱερατείαν, καὶ ὑπέταξε τὴν βασιλείαν τῇ ἱερασίᾳ. Issachar v. fin.: Καὶ ὁ Λευὶ καὶ ὁ Ἰούδας ἐδοξάσθη παρὰ Κυρίου ἐν υἱοῖς Ἰακώβ. Καὶ γὰρ Κύριος ἐκλήρωσεν ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τῷ μὲν ἔδωκε τὴν ἱερατείαν, τῷ δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν. Dan v.: Οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἀποστήσεσθε τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ προσωχθιεῖτε τὸν Λευί καὶ πρὸς Ἰούδαν ἀντιτάξεσθε. Naphtali v. (in a parable): Καὶ ὁ Λευὶ ἐκράτῃ τὸν ἥλιον, καὶ ὁ Ἰούδας φθάσας ἐπίασε τὴν σελήνην. Ibid. viii.: Καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἐντείλασθε τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, ἵνα ἐνοῦνται τῷ Λευί καὶ τῷ Ἰούδᾳ.

⁸³ Levi ix. Note for example the prescription: Καὶ πρὸ τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὰ ἄγρια λούου· καὶ ἐν τῷ θύειν, νίπτου (with which comp. vol. i. p. 278); further, the prescription in the same passage to the effect that no wood was to be used for the altar of burnt-offering but that of trees which were always in leaf (comp. Book of Jubilees, chap. xxi., in Ewald's *Jahrbb.* iii. 19).

Apostle Paul (Benjamin xi.). The Christology upon which those passages proceed is of a decidedly patripassian character.⁸⁴

Grabe, who was the first to edit the Greek text, already endeavoured to account for those incongruities by the hypothesis, that the book was written by a Jew, but had been subsequently interpolated by a Christian. All modern critics however (since Nitzsch) have entirely dismissed this hypothesis, and the only point on which there is a difference of opinion amongst them is as to whether the author occupied the standpoint of a *Jewish* or a *Gentile* Christian. The former is the prevailing view; the latter was propounded by Ritschl in the first edition of his *Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, was subsequently adopted by Vorstman and Hilgenfeld, but was ultimately abandoned again by Ritschl himself. At the same time there was no doubt a feeling on the part of many that it would be impossible to solve the difficulty without having recourse to the interpolation hypothesis. Kayser above all tried to demonstrate the existence of a tolerably large number of such interpolations. But even in his case the matter is dealt with only incidentally, to enable him to maintain the view as to the Jewish-Christian character of the writing. It was reserved for Schnapp to enter in a systematic manner into the question as to whether the whole work had not been reconstructed from beginning to end. He endeavoured to show, that to the book in its original form belonged only the parts mentioned under Nos. 1 and 2 above, i.e. merely the biographical narratives and their accompanying exhortations. But he seeks to prove that all those portions in which the future fortunes of the tribes are predicted, with

⁸⁴ Simeon vi. : Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς μέγας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, Φαινόμενος, ἐπὶ γῆς ὡς ἄνθρωπος. *Ibid.* : Θεὸς σῶμα λαβὼν καὶ συνεσθίαν ἀνθρώποις ἔσασεν ἀνθρώπους. Issachar vii. : ἔχοντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν τὸν Θεὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, συμπορευόμενοι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐν ἀπλότητι καρδίας. Zebulon ix. *fin.* : ὄψεσθε Θεὸν ἐν σχήματι ἀνθρώπου. Dan v. *fin.* : Κύριος ἔσται ἐμμέσῳ αὐτῆς, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συναναστρεφόμενος. Naphtali viii. : ὀφθήσεται Θεὸς κατοικῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Asher vii. : ἕως οὗ ὁ ὕψιστος ἐπισκέψηται τὴν γῆν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔλθων ὡς ἄνθρωπος μετὰ ἀνθρώπων ἐσθίαν καὶ πίνων. Benjamin x. ; παραγενόμενον Θεὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλευθερωτὴν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν.

some other things of a kindred nature (visions in particular), are to be regarded as later interpolations, though he distinguishes at the same time between Jewish and Christian interpolations. He thinks that the bulk of these interpolations would be made by a Jewish hand, but that into these again numerous references to the redemption through Christ had been afterwards inserted by a Christian hand. He considers therefore that the original work itself must also have been of Jewish origin. It appears to me that the latter part of this hypothesis, in so far, that is, as the Christian revision is concerned, has at all events hit the mark. It would be vain to attempt to reduce the heterogeneous utterances in our Testaments to a common Jewish-Christian standpoint, all of them that bear a specifically Christian stamp being without exception of a Gentile-Christian and universalist character. The salvation is destined *εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*. The Christology is the patripassian Christology that so largely prevailed in many quarters in the Christian Church during the second and third centuries. There is nothing here that can be said to indicate a "Jewish-Christian" standpoint. Again it is impossible to reconcile with the Christian passages in question that series of utterances characterized above which can only have emanated from a Jewish author. How is it ever to be supposed that a Christian, ay, or even a Jewish-Christian, author should think of characterizing the tribes of *Levi* and *Judah* as those to whom God had committed the guidance of Israel. Then what could we conceive such an author to mean by exhorting the rest of the tribes to join themselves to the two just mentioned and to submit themselves to their authority? Why, it was precisely the tribes of *Levi* and *Judah*, *i.e.* the official Judaism of Palestine, that distinguished themselves above all the others in the way of rejecting the gospel. We can hardly imagine therefore that even a Jewish-Christian author would be likely to represent them as occupying the leading position above referred to. Nor does he so represent them as one who is merely taking a

theoretical survey of history, and as though he meant to censure the defection from the tribes of Levi and Judah merely as a thing of the past. But he also urges a loyal adherence to those tribes as a present duty. Nor can we here suppose that Levi is intended to represent the Christian clergy. For what in that case would Judah be supposed to represent? ^{34a} Then there is the further circumstance, that many of the Christian passages obviously disturb the connection and thus proclaim themselves to be interpolations at the very outset. What is more, the much canvassed passage regarding Paul in the Testament of Benjamin (xi.) is wanting in the case of two independent testimonies among the manuscripts and versions as at present known to us, namely in the Roman manuscript and the Armenian version.³⁵ From all this it may be regarded as tolerably certain, that *all the Christian passages are to be ascribed to some interpolator* who, with a Jewish original before him, introduced modifications here and there to adapt it to the purposes and needs of the Christian Church. This assumption will also enable us to explain how it comes to be stated in our Testaments that Christ was a descendant of the tribes of Levi and Judah alike.³⁶ How it

^{34a} That the various utterances regarding the tribes of Levi and Judah are of a strictly Jewish character, may be further seen from others of a precisely similar nature in the Book of Jubilees, chap. xxxi. (Ewald's *Jahrbücher*, iii. 39 sq.).

³⁵ See Sinker, *Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum*, Appendix (1879), pp. 27 and 59; and Harnack's notice in *Theol. Literaturztg.* 1879, p. 515. The Roman manuscript has the original text in still another passage (perhaps in more?), where the others show that passage to have undergone a Christian revision. Simeon vii. according to the Roman MS. runs thus: *Καὶ νῦν, τεκνία μου, ἐπακούσατε τοῦ Δεὺ καὶ τοῦ Ἰούδα*, as without doubt it was originally written, whereas the Cambridge MS. reads: *Καὶ νῦν, τεκνία μου, ὑπακούετε Δεὺ καὶ ἐν Ἰούδα λυτρωθήσεσθε*.

³⁶ Simeon vii.: *Ἀναστήσει γὰρ Κύριος ἐκ τοῦ Δεὺ ὡς ἀρχιερέα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰούδα ὡς βασιλέα, Θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον*. Levi ii.: *διὰ σοῦ καὶ Ἰούδα ὁφθή- μεται Κύριος ἐν ἀνθρώποις*. Dan v.: *Καὶ ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα καὶ Δεὺ τὸ σωτήριον Κυρίου*. Gad viii.: *ὅπως τιμήσωσιν Ἰούδαν καὶ τὸν Δεὺ ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀνατελεῖ Κύριος σωτήρα τῷ Ἰσραήλ*. Joseph xix.: *τιμᾶτε τὸν Ἰούδαν καὶ τὸν Δεὺ ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, χάριτι σώζων πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*.

would ever occur to a Christian author himself to emphasize this point so much, even supposing Mary to have belonged to the tribe of Levi, it is difficult to see, for in the primitive Christian tradition it was only upon the descent from Judah that stress was laid. But the matter becomes perfectly intelligible when we assume that the author had a text before him in which *Levi* and *Judah* were held up as the chosen and model tribes. For finding this in his text he proceeds to justify it from his Christian standpoint by representing Christ as descended from the tribe of Levi in His capacity as priest, and from that of Judah in His capacity as king, it being left an open question whether he assumes the Levitical descent of Mary or has in view only some spiritual connection on the part of Christ with both those tribes in virtue of His twofold office of priest and king.³⁷ It is further worthy of note that, deviating from his Jewish original, the Christian interpolator as a rule puts the tribe of Judah first. How long or short those Christian interpolations may have been it is not always possible to determine with any degree of certainty. It is probable however that they were on a larger scale than Schnapp is inclined to suppose.

It is rather more difficult to answer this other question, namely, whether this Jewish original itself was not the production of several authors. The grounds on which Schnapp bases his attempt to distinguish and eliminate the prophetic portions of the book are not quite so cogent in the case of Christian passages. At the same time, there is no denying that in most instances those predictions start up in the book

³⁷ This latter view is favoured by Simeon vii.; at the same time it is possible that, on the strength of Luke i. 36 (Ἐλισάβετ ἡ συγγενὶς σου), the author has assumed the Levitical descent of Mary, as many of the Fathers have also done (on which see Spitta, *Der Brief des Julius Africanus an Aristides*, 1877, p. 44 sqq.). But in any case it is certain that, previous to the author of the Testaments, no writer within the Church had ever directly maintained or in any way emphasized the Levitical descent of Jesus. For Hilgenfeld and, following him, Spitta, have contrived to elicit something of this from the words of Clemens Romanus, chap. xxxii., only by an exegesis of a very singular kind.

with a remarkable suddenness. The Testaments seem to have been intended, in the first instance, to serve as a kind of moral sermon. They concern themselves, as a rule, with some special sin or other of which the patriarch had been guilty and against which he warns his descendants. When we find then that all of a sudden, and in quite a general way, there comes in some prediction about the falling away of the tribes, and that without any further notice being taken of the special sin that had been previously treated of, it becomes evident at once that the connection is thereby interrupted and disturbed, all the more that the terms with which the Testaments conclude are such as imply that they had been preceded by exhortations, and exhortations alone. Comp. above all Simeon v.—vii.; Levi xiv.—xix.^a; Judah xxi.—xxv.; Dan v. In any case we can have no difficulty in detecting in the Testaments a good many interpolations of considerable length, even apart from those passages that are of a specifically Christian kind; take for example the two visions in the Testament of Levi ii.—v. and viii., which only interrupt the connection. Then in the biographical portion of the Testament of Joseph we find two perfectly parallel narratives coming the one immediately after the other (chaps. i.—x.^a and x.^b—xviii.), of which only one can be supposed to be the original one. Again in the course of what is said with regard to the tribe of Levi we come across this glaring contradiction, that while on the one hand it is recommended to the other tribes as their leader, it is represented on the other as having itself fallen away, nay as having been instrumental in seducing the rest into apostasy (Levi xiv.; Dan v.). Both those classes of statements cannot possibly have emanated from one and the same person. We may therefore say that in any case the Testaments have undergone repeated revision and remodification. But this much however may be held as certain, that the great bulk of the book is of Jewish origin. *The foremost place in it is assigned to these moral sermons, which remind us partly of Jesus the Son of Sirach, and partly of Philo, and*

which must have emanated from some author to whom moral conduct was a matter of deeper interest than the ceremonial law. Along with these we have prophetic passages composed by the same or some other author, in which the falling away from Levi and Judah is represented as being the cause of all evil, while the members of the nation, scattered throughout the whole world, are recommended to enter into close relationship with these tribes, therefore with the leading circles of Palestine. On the *date of the composition* of our book it is impossible to express anything like a definite opinion. As it is probable that the Christian revision was already known to Irenaeus, the Jewish original cannot have been composed later than the first century of our era, though, on the other hand, we can scarcely venture to refer it to an earlier date, seeing that the author probably made use of the Book of Jubilees (see below). In several passages the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple is presupposed (Levi xv.; Dan v. *fin.*). But it is extremely doubtful whether these are to be regarded as belonging to the work in its original shape. Possibly they were subsequently inserted by some Christian hand.

On the *references in our book to earlier writings*, see Sinker, *Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum* (1869), pp. 34-48; Dillmann in Ewald's *Jahrb. der bibl. Wissensch.* iii. 91-94; Rönisch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen* (1874), pp. 325 sqq., 415 sqq. References to the predictions of Enoch are of very frequent occurrence (Simeon v.; Levi x., xiv., xvi.; Judah xviii.; Zebulon iii.; Dan v.; Naphtali iv.; Benjamin ix.). These passages all belong to the prophetic sections, though in the majority of instances they are not actual quotations, but free allusions to alleged predictions of Enoch, with the view of explaining how the patriarchs obtained their information with regard to the future. Surely from this it is perfectly obvious that the author must have already been acquainted with one or more of the various books bearing the name of Enoch. In the biographical portions therefore, in those sections which undoubtedly belong to the original work, there are numerous coincidences with the Book of Jubilees. But neither are these absent from those portions which, according to Schnapp, are supposed to belong to the author of the Jewish revision. See in general Dillmann and Rönisch, as above.

In *patristic literature* the notion of the descent of Christ from the tribes of Levi and Judah is met with as early as the time of Irenaeus, which notion is probably to be traced to our book; see Irenaeus, *Fragm.* xvii. (ed. Harvey, ii. 487): 'Εξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς προετυπώθη καὶ ἐπεγυώσθη καὶ ἐγεννήθη'

ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ Ἰωσήφ προετυπώθη· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Λευὶ καὶ τοῦ Ἰούδα τὸ κατὰ τὰρκα
 ὡς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεὺς ἐγεννήθη· διὰ δὲ τοῦ Συμεὼν ἐν τῷ ναῶ ἐπεγνώσθη κ.τ.λ.
 The passages in Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion*, v. 1, *Scorpiace* xiii., which since
 Grabe's time (*Spicileg.* i. 132) have usually been traced to the Testament
 of Benjamin xi., are simply based on Gen. xlix. 27; similarly *Hippolyt.* ed.
 Lagarde, p. 140, fragm. 50. It is not unlikely that the passage about Paul
 in Benjamin xi. would be inserted in the text of the Testament at a very
 late period, and that on the strength of the patristic interpretation of Gen.
 xlix. 27; comp. p. 119. The Testaments are expressly quoted by Origen,
In Josuam homil. xv. 6 (ed. de la Rue, ii. 435; Lommatzsch, xi. 143): Sed
 et in aliquo quodam libello, qui appellatur testamentum duodecim patri-
 archarum, quamvis non habeatur in canone, talem tamen quendam sensum
 invenimus, quod per singulos peccantes singuli satanae intelligi debeant
 (comp. Reuben iii.). It is doubtful whether Procopius Gazaenus may be
 supposed to have our book in view in his *Comment. in Gen.* xxxviii. (see the
 passage in Sinker's *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 4). In the Stichometry of Nicephorus
 the Πατριάρχαι are included among the ἀπόκρυφα along with Enoch, the
 Assumptio Mosis and such like (Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 121);
 similarly in the *Synopsis Athanasii* (Credner, p. 145) and in the anonymous
 list of canonical books edited by Montfaucon, Pitra and others (on which
 see p. 126 below). In the *Constitut. apostol.* vi. 16, mention is made of an
 apocryphal work entitled οἱ τρεῖς πατριάρχαι, which must be different from
 the book now in question, unless there has been some mistake with regard
 to the number.

Four manuscripts of the Greek text are extant: (1) A Cambridge one
 belonging to the tenth century; (2) an Oxford one belonging to the four-
 teenth (on both of which see Sinker's *Test. XII. Patr.* pp. vi.-xi.); (3) a
 manuscript in the Vatican Library belonging to the thirteenth century;
 and (4) one in the cloister of St. John in Patmos belonging to the sixteenth
 (on both of which again see Sinker, *Appendix*, 1879, pp. 1-7). In addition
 to these we should also mention, as independent testimonies, (1) the as yet
 unprinted Armenian version, eight manuscripts of which have been verified
 by Sinker, and the oldest of which dates from the year 1220 A.D. (Sinker,
Appendix, pp. 23-27, and p. vii. sq.); and (2) the Old Slavonic version, which
 was published by Tichonravow in his *Pamjatniki otrschennoi russkoi lite-
 ratury* (2 vols. Petersburg 1863), but which has not yet been submitted to
 critical investigation.

As yet no trace has been discovered of any early Latin version. But
 coming down to the thirteenth century we find the Latin version of Robert
 Grossetest, Bishop of Lincoln, and which, as Sinker has shown, is based
 upon the Cambridge manuscript (see Grabe's *Spicileg.* i. 144; Sinker, *Ap-
 pendix*, p. 8). This version has come down to us through numerous manu-
 scripts (Sinker's *Test.* pp. xi.-xv., *Appendix*, p. 9), and, since the beginning
 of the sixteenth century, it has not only been frequently printed (at first
 without place or date being given, though probably about 1510-1520, see
 Sinker, *Appendix*, p. 10; on the later impressions consult Sinker, *Test.*
 p. xvi. sq.), but likewise translated into almost every modern language
 —English, French, German, Dutch, Danish, Icelandic, Bohemian, while

these translations again were also frequently printed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Sinker, *Appendix*, pp. 11–23).

The first edition of the Greek text was prepared by Grabe, who based it upon the Cambridge manuscript, collating it at the same time with the Oxford one. This edition also contained Grossetest's Latin version, for which two manuscripts belonging to the Bodleian Library were made use of (Grabe, *Spicilegium Patrum*, vol. i. Oxon. 1698, 2nd ed. 1714; on the use of the manuscripts, see p. 336 sq.). Grabe's text has been reproduced by Fabricius (*Codex pseudepigraphus Vet. Test.* vol. i. Hamburg 1713), Gallandi (*Bibliotheca veterum patrum*, vol. i. Venetiis 1788), and Migne (*Patrolog. graec.* vol. ii.). A careful edition of the Cambridge manuscript, accompanied with the variants of the Oxford one, has been printed by Sinker (*Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum, ad fidem codicis Cantabrigiensis edita, accedunt lectiones cod. Oxoniensis*, Cambridge 1869). Some time after this same scholar published in an Appendix a collation of the Vatican and the Patmos manuscripts (*Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum: Appendix containing a collation of the Roman and Patmos MSS. and bibliographical notes*, Cambridge 1879).

Special disquisitions: Grabe in his edition (*Spicileg.* i. 129–144 and 335–374). Corrodi, *Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus*, ii. 101–110. K. J. Nitzsch, *Commentatio critica de Testamentis XII. Patriarcharum, libro V. T. pseudepigrapho*, Wittenberg 1810. Wieseler, *Die 70 Wochen und die 63 Jahrwochen des Propheten Daniel* (1839), p. 226 sqq. Lücke, *Einkl. in die Offenbarung Johannis* (2nd ed. 1852), pp. 334–337. Dorner, *Entwicklungsgesch. der Lehre von der Person Christi*, i. 254–264. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Neuen Testaments*, § 257. Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der alt-kathol. Kirche* (2nd ed. 1857), pp. 172–177. Kayser, “Die Test. der XII. Patr.,” in the *Beiträge zu den theologischen Wissenschaften*, edited by Reuss and Cunitz, 3 vols. (1851) pp. 107–140. Vorstman, *Disquisitio de Testamentorum Patriarcharum XII. origine et pretio*, Rotterd. 1857. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1858, p. 395 sqq.; 1871, p. 302 sqq. Van Hengel, “De Testamenten der twaalf Patriarchen op nieuw ter sprake gebracht” (*Godgeleerde Bijdragen*, 1860). Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vii. 363–369. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina* (1866), pp. 140–157. Sinker in his edition. Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben*, 1869, pp. 116–135; 1871, pp. 123–125. Friedr. Nitzsch, *Grundriss der christl. Dogmengeschichte*, vol. i. 1870, pp. 109–111. Renan, *L'église chrétienne* (1879), pp. 268–271. An article in *The Presbyterian Review* for January 1880 (mentioned by Bissell, *The Apocrypha*, p. 671). Dillmann, art. “Pseudepigraphen,” in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vol. xii. p. 361 sq. Schnapp, *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen untersucht*, Halle 1884 (and notice of this work in the *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1885, p. 203).

7. *The Lost Pseudepigraphic Prophecies.*

Besides the pseudepigraphic prophecies that have come down to us, many others of a similar description were in

circulation in the early Church, as we learn partly from the lists of the canon and partly from quotations found in the Fathers. In the case of most of them it is of course no longer possible to determine with any certainty whether they were of Jewish or of Christian origin. But, considering that in the earliest days of the Christian Church this was a species of literary activity that flourished chiefly among the heretical sects, and that it was not till a somewhat later period that it began to be cultivated in Catholic circles as well, it may be assumed with some degree of probability that *those Old Testament pseudepigraphic writings which are mentioned in terms of high respect by the earliest of the Fathers, down say to Origen inclusive, are to be regarded generally as being of Jewish and not of Christian origin.* With the criterion thus obtained we may combine still another. We happen to have several lists of the canon in which the Old Testament Apocrypha are enumerated with great completeness. Now, among the writings thus enumerated, occur those which have come down to us (Enoch, the Twelve Patriarchs, the Assumptio Mosis, the Psalms of Solomon), and which are undoubtedly of Jewish origin. This then must surely be regarded as sufficiently justifying the conjecture that the others would also be of similar origin. The lists in question are the following:—

1. The so-called *Stichometry of Nicephorus*, i.e. a list of the canonical and apocryphal books of the Old and New Testaments along with the number of verses in each book, and which list is given as an appendix to the *Chronographia compendiaria* of Nicephorus Constantinopolitanus (about 800 A.D.), though it is, without doubt, of a considerably earlier origin (printed in the appendix to Dindorf's edition of George Syncellus, further in a critically amended text given by Credner in two programmes for the University of Giessen 1832–1838, and also reproduced in Credner's *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, 1847, pp. 117–122, but best of all in de Boor's *Nicephori opuscula*, Lips. 1880). Here the list of the Old Testament ἀπόκρυφα runs thus (ed. de Boor, p. 134 sq.):—

- α' Ἐνώχ στίχων ,δω' (4800).
 β' Πατριάρχαι στίχων ,ερ' (5100).
 γ' Προσευχὴ Ἰωσήφ στίχων ,αρ' (1100).
 δ' Διαθήκη Μωϋσέως στίχων ,αρ' (1100).
 ε' Ἀνάληψις Μωϋσέως στίχων ,αυ' (1400).
 ς' Ἀβραὰμ στίχων τ' (300).
 ζ' Ἑλὰδ (*sic*) καὶ Μωδὰδ στίχων υ' (400).
 η' Ἡλία προφήτου στίχων τισ' (316).
 θ' Σοφονίου προφήτου στίχων χ' (600).
 ι' Ζαχαρίου πατρὸς Ἰωάννου στίχων φ' (500).
 ια' Βαρούχ, Ἀμβακούμ, Ἰεζεκιήλ καὶ Δαυιήλ ψευδεπίγραφα

2. The so-called *Synopsis Athanasii*, which simply reproduces from the *Stichometry of Nicephorus* the section containing the Apocrypha, without giving however the number of the verses (Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, p. 145).

3. Akin to this latter is an *anonymous list* which was published: (a) from a *Codex Coislinianus* belonging to the tenth century by Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, Paris 1715, p. 194; (b) from a *Cod. Paris. Regius* by Cotelier, *Patrum Apost. Opp.* vol. i. 1698, p. 196; (c) from a *Cod. Baroccianus* by Hody, *De Bibliorum textibus*, 1705, p. 649, col. 44 (those three manuscripts are based upon each other in the order just given and as may be seen from a more careful comparing of them with the text); and lastly, (d) from a *Codex Vaticanus* by Pitra, *Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta*, vol. i. Romae 1864, p. 100. As appears from the numbering, there is an omission in the three first-mentioned manuscripts (No. 8 being left out). According to Pitra, the complete list of the ἀπόκρυφα is as follows:—

- α' Ἀδάμ.
 β' Ἐνώχ.
 γ' Δάμεχ.
 δ' Πατριάρχαι.
 ε' Ἰωσήφ προσευχῇ.

- ζ' Ἑλδὰμ καὶ Μοδάμ (αλ. Ἑλδὰδ καὶ Μωδὰδ).
 ζ' Διαθήκη Μωσέως.
 η' Ἡ ἀνάληψις Μωσέως.
 θ' Ψαλμοὶ Σολομῶντος.
 ι' Ἡλίου ἀποκάλυψις.
 ια' Ἡσαίου ὄρασις.
 ιβ' Σοφονίου ἀποκάλυψις.
 ιγ' Ζαχαρίου ἀποκάλυψις.
 ιδ' Ἑσδρα ἀποκάλυψις.
 ιε' Ἰακώβοι ἱστορία.
 ις' Πέτρου ἀποκάλυψις, and so on (these being followed by other New Testament Apocrypha).

This list is in the main identical with that of the *Stichometry of Nicephorus*. With a single exception (No. 6, Ἀβραάμ), the whole of the first ten numbers of the *Stichometry* are reproduced in it. But besides this these nine numbers have this in common with each other, that they are probably all of them *prophetic pseudepigraphs*, i.e. writings purporting to have been composed by the various men of God whose names they bear, or at all events containing a record of revelations with which those men are alleged to have been favoured, a circumstance which probably accounts for their comparatively wide circulation throughout the Church. The last of the nine here in question shows by its title, Ζαχαρίου πατρὸς Ἰωάννου, that it belongs to the Christian Apocrypha. With regard to the others, four of them have already been considered by us (Enoch, the Patriarchs, the Testament and the Ascension of Moses; on the two latter, see p. 81), while the remaining four (Joseph's Prayer, Eldad and Modad, Elias, Zephaniah) are all quoted with deference either by Origen or by some still older Fathers, and may therefore be regarded, with a certain degree of probability, as *Jewish* products. Consequently they fall to be more fully considered by us here.

1. Joseph's Prayer (Προσευχὴ Ἰωσήφ). For the infor-

mation we possess regarding this production we are indebted above all to repeated quotations from it found in Origen. This Father speaks of it as "a writing not to be despised" (*οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητον γραφήν*), and expressly states that it was *in use among the Jews* (*παρ' Ἑβραίοις*). In the passages quoted it is Jacob who figures all through, describing himself as the first-born of all living beings, nay as the head of all the angels themselves. He informs us that when he was coming from Mesopotamia he met Uriel who wrestled with him, and claimed to be the foremost of the angels. But he says that he corrected him, and told him that he, Uriel, was only the eighth in rank after himself. In another passage Jacob states that he had had an opportunity of inspecting the heavenly records, and that there he read the future destinies of men.

Origen, *In Joann.* vol. ii. chap. xxv. (*Opp.* ed. de la Rue, iv. 84; Lommatzsch, i. 147): *Εἰ δέ τις προσίεται καὶ τῶν παρ' Ἑβραίοις φερομένων ἀποκρύφων τὴν ἐπιγραφομένην Ἰωσήφ προσευχὴν, ἀντικρυς τοῦτο τὸ δόγμα καὶ σαφῶς εἰρημένον ἐκείθεν λήψεται . . . Φησὶ γοῦν ὁ Ἰακώβ· "Ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἐγὼ Ἰακώβ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ, ἄγγελος θεοῦ εἰμι ἐγὼ καὶ πνεῦμα ἀρχικόν· καὶ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ προεκτίσθησαν πρὸ παντὸς ἔργου· ἐγὼ δὲ Ἰακώβ, ὁ κληθεὶς ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων Ἰακώβ, τὸ δὲ ὄνομά μου Ἰσραὴλ, ὁ κληθεὶς ὑπὸ θεοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, ἀνὴρ ὁρῶν θεόν, ὅτι ἐγὼ πρωτόγονος παντὸς ζώου ζουμένου ὑπὸ θεοῦ." Καὶ ἐπιφέρει· "Ἐγὼ δὲ ὅτε ἤρχόμην ἀπὸ Μεσοποταμίας τῆς Συρίας, ἐξῆλθεν Οὐριήλ ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ εἶπεν, ὅτι κατέβην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ κατεσκήνωσα ἐν ἀνθρώποις· καὶ ὅτι ἐκλήθην ὀνόματι Ἰακώβ, ἐξήλωσε καὶ ἐμαχίσάτο μοι, καὶ ἐπάλασε πρὸς μὲ λέγων· προτερήσειν ἐπάνω τοῦ ὀνόματός μου τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πρὸ [l. πρὸ τοῦ] παντὸς ἀγγέλου. Καὶ εἶπα αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ πόσος ἐστὶν ἐν υἱοῖς θεοῦ· οὐχὶ σὺ Οὐριήλ ὄγδοος ἐμοῦ, καὶ γὰρ Ἰσραὴλ ἀρχάγγελος δυνάμεως κυρίου καὶ ἀρχιχιλίαρχός εἰμι ἐν υἱοῖς θεοῦ· οὐχὶ ἐγὼ Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐν προσώπῳ θεοῦ λειτουργὸς πρῶτος, καὶ ἐπεκαλεσάμην ἐν ὀνόματι ἀσβεστοῦ τὸν θεόν μου."*

Origen, *ibid.* (Lommatzsch, i. 148): *Ἐπὶ πλείον δὲ παρεξέβημεν παραλαβόντες τὸν περὶ Ἰακώβ λόγον, καὶ μαρτυράμενοι ἡμῖν οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητον γραφήν.*

Origen, *Fragm. comment. in Genes.*³⁸ vol. iii. chap. ix. toward the end (ed. de la Rue, ii. 15; Lommatzsch, viii. 30 sq. = Euseb. *Praep. evang.* vi. 11. 64, ed. Gaisford): *Διόπερ ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ δύναται οὕτω νοεῖσθαι τὸ λεγόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰακώβ· "Ἀνέγων γὰρ ἐν ταῖς πλαξὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὅσα συμβήσεται ὑμῖν καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς ὑμῶν."* Comp. also *ibid.* chap. xii. toward the

³⁸ The large fragment from the third book of the Commentary on Genesis is to be found in the *Philocalia*, chap. xxiii. (*Origenis Opp.* ed. Lommatzsch, vol. xxv.), and the most of it also in Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* vi. 11.

end of the chapter (ed. de la Rue, ii. 19; Lommatzsch, viii. 38), where the contents of the somewhat lengthened fragment first quoted are given in an abridged form.

Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 761-771. Dillmann, art. "Pseudepigraphen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 362.

2. The book entitled *Eldad and Modad*. This was a writing that was circulated under the name of two Israelites called עֲלֵדָד and מֹדָד (Sept. *Ἐλδαδ καὶ Μωδάδ*), who according to Num. xi. 26-29 uttered certain predictions in the camp during the march through the wilderness. Besides being mentioned in the lists of the Apocrypha, this book is also quoted in the Shepherd of Hermas, and that as a genuine prophetical work. According to the *Targum of Jonathan on* Num. xi. 26-29, the predictions of the two personages here in question had reference chiefly to Magog's final attack upon the congregation of Israel. But whether this may be regarded as indicating what the theme of our book is likely to have been is extremely doubtful.

Hermas, *Pastor*, Vis. ii. 3: *Ἐγγὺς κύριος τοῖς ἐπιστρεφομένοις, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἐλδαδ καὶ Μωδάτ, τοῖς προφητεύουσιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῷ λαῷ.*

The Targum of Jonathan on the Pentateuch is given in the fourth volume of the London Polyglot along with a Latin translation. Comp. also Beer, "Eldad and Medad im Pseudojonathan" (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1857, pp. 346-350). Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*, 1880, p. 370.

Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 801-804. Dillmann, art. "Pseudepigraphen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 363. Cotelier, Hilgenfeld and Harnack in their editions of the Shepherd of Hermas, notes on Vision ii. 3.

3. The *Apocalypse of Elijah*. The prophet Elijah has this in common with Enoch, that like him he was taken up to heaven without dying. Consequently in the legends of the saints he is often associated with Enoch (for the literature of this, see Enoch, p. 70), and like this latter could not fail to be regarded as a peculiarly suitable medium through which to communicate heavenly revelations. A writing bearing his name is mentioned in the *Constitut. apostol.* vi. 16, and in the patristic quotations simply as an Apocryphum. According to the more exact titles as given in the lists of the

Apocrypha (*Ἡλία προφήτου* in Nicephorus, *Ἡλίου ἀποκάλυψις* in the anonymous list) and in Jerome (see below), this book was a somewhat short apocalyptic work consisting, according to the Stichometry of Nicephorus, of 316 verses. It is often mentioned by Origen and subsequent ecclesiastical writers as being the source of a quotation made by Paul, and which cannot be traced to any part of the Old Testament (1 Cor. ii. 9: *καθὼς γέγραπται ἃ ὀφθαλμοὺς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη κ.τ.λ.*). No doubt Jerome strongly protests against the notion that Paul is here quoting an apocryphal work. But the thing is not at all incredible, for do we not find that the Book of Enoch has also been undoubtedly quoted by the author of the Epistle of Jude? If that be so, then this circumstance serves at the same time to prove the early existence and Jewish origin of the Apocalypse of Elijah. This same passage that is quoted in First Corinthians is likewise quoted by Clemens Romanus, chap. xxxiv. *fin.* Now as non-canonical quotations occur elsewhere in Clement, it is just possible that he, in like manner, has made use of the Apocalypse of Elijah. At the same time it is more likely that he has borrowed the quotation from the First Epistle to the Corinthians. According to Epiphanius, the passage Eph. v. 14 (*ἐγείρε ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός*) was also taken from our Apocryphum. But seeing that Origen makes no mention of this in his collations of passages of this sort, that statement is of a very questionable character, and probably rests upon some confusion or other. According to Euthalius, Eph. v. 14 was taken from an apocryphal work that bore the name of Jeremiah.

Origen, *Comment. ad Matth.* xxvii. 9 (de la Rue, iii. 916; Lommatzsch, v. 29): Et apostolus scripturas quasdam secretorum profert, sicut dicit alicubi: "quod oculus non vidit, nec auris audivit" (1 Cor. ii. 9); in nullo enim regulari libro hoc positum invenitur, nisi in secretis Eliae prophetae. Comp. further, *Comment. ad Matt.* xxiii. 37 (de la Rue, iii. 848; Lommatzsch, iv. 237 sqq.), where, in connection with the saying of Christ that Jerusalem killed the prophets, Origen observes that the Old Testament records only a single

instance of a prophet being put to death in Jerusalem, and then proceeds to add: Propterea videndum, ne forte oporteat ex libris secretioribus, qui apud Judaeos feruntur, ostendere verbum Christi, et non solum Christi, sed etiam discipulorum ejus (for example such further statements as Heb. xi. 37) . . . Fertur ergo in scripturis non manifestis serratum esse Jesaiam, et Zachariam occisum, et Ezechielem. Arbitror autem circuisse in melotis [ἐν μελωταῖς, Heb. xi. 37], in pellibus caprinis Eliam, qui in solitudine et in montibus vagabatur. And so among the other passages that go to prove that apocryphal books are sometimes referred to in the New Testament we should also include 1 Cor. ii. 9. Lastly, Origen goes on to observe: Oportet ergo caute considerare, ut nec omnia secreta, quae feruntur in nomine sanctorum, suscipiamus propter Judaeos, qui forte ad destructionem veritatis scripturarum nostrarum quaedam finxerunt, confirmantes dogmata falsa, nec omnia abjiciamus, quae pertinent ad demonstrationem scripturarum nostrarum. The whole connection here plainly shows that it is exclusively Jewish Apocrypha that Origen has in view.

Euthalius in his learned statistical work on the Epistles of Paul (458 A.D.) likewise traces 1 Cor. ii. 9 to the Apocalypse of Elijah (Zaccagni, *Collectanea monumentorum veterum*, Romae 1698, p. 556=Gallandi, *Biblioth. patrum*, x. 258). In this he is followed by Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 48, and an anonymous list of quotations in Paul's Epistles, which is given (a) by Montfaucon (*Diarium Italicum*, p. 212 sq., and *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum*, i. 195) from a *Codex Basilianus*, and (b) by Cotelier (in his edition of the Apostolic Fathers, note on *Constitut. apost.* vi. 16) from two Parisian manuscripts.

Jerome, *Epist.* 57 ad Pammachium, chap. ix. (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, i. 314): Pergamus ad apostolum Paulum. Scribit ad Corinthios: Si enim cognovissent Dominum gloriae, etc. (1 Cor. ii. 8-9). . . . Solent in hoc loco apocryphorum quidam deliramenta sectari et dicere, quod de apocalypsi Eliae testimonium sumtum sit, etc. (Jerome then traces the quotation to Isa. lxiv. 3). Idem, *Comment. in Jesaiam*, lxiv. 3 [al. lxiv. 4] (Vallarsi, iv. 761): Paraphrasim hujus testimonii quasi Hebraeus ex Hebraeis assumit apostolus Paulus de authenticis libris in epistola quam scribit ad Corinthios (1 Cor. ii. 9), non verbum ex verbo reddens, quod facere omnino contemnit, sed sensuum exprimens veritatem, quibus utitur ad id quod voluerit roborandum. Unde apocryphorum deliramenta conticeant, quae ex occasione hujus testimonii ingeruntur ecclesiis Christi. . . . Ascensio enim Isaiae et *Apocalypsis Eliae* hoc habent testimonium.

Clemens Rom. chap. xxxiv. fin.: λέγει γάρ· Ὁφθαλμός οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίᾳ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν (in St. Paul: τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν). Comp. the note on this in Gebhardt and Harnack's edition. The passage is also frequently quoted elsewhere in patristic literature, and was a special favourite with the Gnostics; see Hilgenfeld, *Die apostol. Väter*, p. 102; Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkathol. Kirche*, p. 267 sq.

Epiphanius, *Haer.* xlii. p. 372, ed. Petav. (Dindorf, ii. 388): “Διὸ λέγει, ἔγχευε ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφάνευσαι σοι ὁ Χριστός” (Eph. v. 14). Πόθεν τῷ ἀποστόλῳ τὸ “διὸ καὶ λέγει,” ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς παλαιᾶς

δηλον διαθήκη; ; τοῦτο δὲ ἐμφέρεται παρὰ τῷ Ἡλίῳ. Hippolytus, *De Christo et Antichr.*, chap. lxx., quotes the same passage (Eph. v. 14) with the formula ὁ προφῆτης λέγει, and with a slight deviation in regard to the terms (ἐξεγέρθητι instead of ἀνδρα). It also occurs with the same deviation and with the formula ἡ γραφή λέγει in an utterance of the Naasenes quoted by Hippolytus (*Philosophum.* v. 7, p. 146, ed. Duncker). But both those quotations are undoubtedly to be traced simply to the Epistle to the Ephesians (Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extra canonem receptum*, 2nd ed. iv. 74, thinks, though without any distinct ground for doing so, that they may have been taken from the Apocalypse of Peter). According to Euthalius, Eph. v. 14 formed part of an Apocryphum that bore the name of Jeremiah (Zaccagni, *Collectanea monumentorum veterum*, p. 561 = Gallandi, *Biblioth. patr.* x. 260). Similarly Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 48, and the above-mentioned anonymous list of Paul's quotations from the Scriptures, which simply reproduces Euthalius. We may safely venture to assume that this Apocryphum bearing the name of Jeremiah was itself of Christian origin.

The work by the Hellenist Eupolemus, *περὶ τῆς Ἡλίου προφητείας* (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 30), has nothing to do with our Apocryphum. On this see sec. 33. Isr. Levi endeavours to make out the probable existence of a Hebrew Apocalypse of Elijah on the strength of two Talmudic passages (*Sanhedrin* 97b; *Joma* 19b), where certain utterances of Elijah regarding questions of Messianic dogma happen to be quoted (*Revue des études juives*, vol. i. 1880, p. 108 sqq.). On a passage of this sort from post-Talmudic times, see Jellinek, *Bet-ha-Midrash*, vol. iii.

Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 1070–1086. Lücke, *Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes*, 2nd ed. p. 235 sq. Bleek, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 330 sq. Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 359. The commentaries on 1 Cor. ii. 9 and Eph. v. 14.

4. *The Apocalypse of Zephaniah.* Apart from the Stichometry of Nicephorus and the anonymous list of the Apocrypha (see p. 126), all we know of this writing is from a quotation in Clement of Alexandria.

Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 11. 77 : Ἄρ' οὐχ ὅμοια ταῦτα τοῖς ὑπὸ Σοφο-νία λεχθεῖσι τοῦ προφῆτου ; “καὶ ἀνέλαβέν με πνεῦμα καὶ ἀνήνεγκέν με εἰς οὐρανὸν πέμπτον καὶ ἰθεῶρουν ἀγγέλους καλουμένους κυρίους, καὶ τὸ διάδημα αὐτῶν ἐπικείμενον ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ ἦν ἐκάστου αὐτῶν ὁ θρόνος ἐπταπλάσιον φωτὸς ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος, οἰκοῦντας ἐν ναοῖς σατυρίας καὶ ὑμνοῦντας θεὸν ἄρρητον ὑψίστον.”

Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 1140 sq. Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* xii. 360.

The Apocalypses we have just been considering are far from exhausting the number of them that were in circulation in the early Church. At the end of the Stichometry of Nicephorus mention is made of *ψευδεπίγραφα* of Baruch

Habakkuk, Ezekiel, and Daniel. As we have already stated, Euthalius was acquainted with an Apocryphum bearing the name of Jeremiah. Jerome mentions a Hebrew Apocryphum bearing this prophet's name in which Matt. xxvii. 9 occurred.³⁹ But as regards all these and many others besides, it is extremely doubtful, for various reasons, and chiefly from their appearing somewhat late in the Christian Church, whether they are of Jewish origin. It is obvious that the four last-mentioned pseudepigraphs are to be regarded as an addition at some subsequent period to the original Stichometry of Nicephorus.

VI. THE SACRED LEGENDS.

The authors of the pseudepigraphic prophecies had chiefly in view the practical aim of imparting greater weight to the lessons and exhortations which they desired to address to their contemporaries by ascribing them to the sacred authorities whose names they bear. Not only however did they represent the holy men of God themselves as speaking to posterity, but it was not uncommon at the same time to enrich the accounts we have *regarding those personages* with new material, partly for the purpose of giving to the present generation a clearer view of the sacred narrative generally by the addition of copious details, and partly by surrounding these saints of the olden time with a halo of glory, to hold them up more and more unreservedly as shining models for Israel to imitate (comp. in general, Div. ii. vol. i. p. 339 et seq.). Now there were two ways in which the things here in question, viz. the amplifying and embellishing of the sacred story and adapting it to purposes of edification, could be effected, either by a *continual modifying of the text of the Biblical narrative*, or by *singling*

³⁹ Jerome, *ad Matth.* xxvii. 9 (Vallarsi, vii. 1, 228) : *Legi nuper in quodam Hebraico volumine, quod Nazaraenae sectae mihi Hebraeus obtulit, Jeremiae apocryphum, in quo haec ad verbum scripta reperi.*

out certain personages in it and making them the heroes of fictitious legends. At first it was the former of these courses that was chiefly followed, though afterwards the latter came more and more to be adopted as well. A classical example of each of those two modes of enriching the sacred story has come down to us from a comparatively early period, from somewhere about the time of Christ. The so-called *Book of Jubilees* is an instance of the way in which the text was modified, while in the *Martyrdom of Isaiah* we have a specimen of the fictitious legend. Other writings of this description are either known to us merely from quotations or have come down to us only in the shape of Christian versions of them. But a large amount of material of this sort is also to be found in writings the principal objects of which are different from those mentioned above. Legendary amplifications of the sacred narrative are also to be met with in almost all of the pseudepigraphic prophecies. This, as appears from what has been already said, is true above all of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs into which the biographical element enters so largely. And so for this reason it has also very many points of contact with the first of the two principal works which we will now proceed to consider.

1. *The Book of Jubilees.*

Didymus Alexandrinus, Epiphanius, and Jerome quote an apocryphal book under the title τὰ Ἰωβηλαῖα or ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσις, from which they borrow various details connected with the history of the patriarchs. Then copious extracts from this same work are given by the Byzantine chroniclers Syncellus, Cedrenus, Zonaras, Glycas, from the beginning of the ninth down to the twelfth century. But at this latter point the book disappears, and for a long time it was looked upon as lost, till it turned up again in the present century in the Abyssinian Church, where it was found in an Ethiopic version. It was published for the first time by Dillmann in

a German translation (Ewald's *Jahrbücher*, ii.—iii. 1850–1851), and afterwards in the Ethiopic text (1859). Besides this Ethiopic version, a large fragment of the work is likewise extant in an old Latin version which in like manner was not discovered till modern times, the author of the discovery being Ceriani, who found it in a manuscript in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, and afterwards published it among the *Monumenta sacra et profana* (vol. i. fasc. 1, 1861). This Latin fragment was also subsequently edited by Rönsch, accompanied with a Latin rendering by Dillmann of the corresponding portion in the Ethiopic version, as well as a commentary and several excursuses full of valuable matter (1874).

The contents of the book are substantially the same as those of our canonical Genesis, for which reason it is also generally styled "*the smaller Genesis*," not because it is of smaller dimensions (on the contrary, it is larger than the other), but because it is inferior in point of authority to the canonical book. It stands to this latter very much in the same relation as a *Haggadean commentary* to the text of the Bible. At the same time it is as far as possible from being an actual exposition of the text, which in fact the Haggadean Midrash never pretends to be, but simply a *free reproduction of the early Biblical history from the creation of the world down to the institution of the Passover* (Ex. xii.), and that from the standpoint and in the spirit of later Judaism. The whole is made to assume the form of a revelation imparted to Moses on Mount Sinai by an "angel of the presence." The object of the author in selecting this form was to secure at once for the new matters which he has to communicate the same authority as was already accorded to the text of the Bible. In his reproduction he has paid special attention to the matter of chronology, the due fixing of this being without doubt one of the leading objects for which his book was written. He takes as the basis of reckoning the *jubilee-period* of 49 years, which again resolves itself into

seven year-weeks of seven years each, and then, in fixing the date of any event, he determines the exact month of the exact year of the exact year-week of the exact jubilee-period in which it occurred. From this it is not difficult to see why the whole book was called τὰ Ἰωβηλαία, "the Jubilees." As the author was interested in chronology generally, so he lays a peculiar stress upon the observance of the *annual festivals*, and endeavours to prove with regard to each of the leading feasts that it had been instituted in the very earliest times; so for example with regard to Pentecost or the feast of Weeks (Ewald's *Jahrb.* ii. 245, iii. 8), the feast of Tabernacles (*Ibid.* iii. 11), the great Day of Atonement (iii. 46), and the feast of the Passover (iii. 68 sq.). This also serves to explain why it is that he happens to finish with the institution of the Passover (Ex. xii.).

As the author seeks to reproduce the history of primitive times *in the spirit of his own day*, he deals with the Biblical text in a very free fashion. Many things that did not happen to interest him, or that he considered objectionable, were either omitted or altered, while others were still further amplified by the addition of numerous particulars of one kind or another. He is always by way of showing exactly where the founders of the primitive families or races got their wives from; he explains how far Gen. ii. 17 had been literally fulfilled (comp. Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* chap. lxxxi.), with whose help Noah brought the animals into the ark, how the Hamitic family of the Canaanites and the Japhetic one of the Medes found their way within the sphere of the Semitic family, why Rebecca had such a decided preference for Jacob,⁴⁰ and so on. He is acquainted with the names of the wives of the whole of the patriarchs from Adam down to the twelve sons of Jacob, he knows the name of the particular peak of Mount Ararat on which Noah's ark rested, and many other things of a similar kind.⁴¹ All those embellishments and amplifications

⁴⁰ Dillmann in Ewald's *Jahrb.* vol. iii. p. 78 sq.

⁴¹ *Ibid.* p. 80.

are entirely in the spirit of later Judaism. A peculiarly characteristic feature is the circumstance that the patriarchs are represented as paragons of moral excellence to even a greater extent than in the Biblical narrative itself, and as being already in the habit of observing the whole of the Mosaic ritual, of offering sacrifices and firstlings, and of celebrating the annual festivals, the new moons, and the Sabbaths. It is further characteristic, that everywhere the *hierarchia coelestis* is represented as forming the background of this world's history. The angels, good and evil alike, are regularly interfering with the course of human affairs, and inciting men to good and evil actions. We learn that the angels observed the law in heaven long before it was promulgated upon earth. For from the very beginning that law stood inscribed upon the heavenly tablets, and it was only by degrees that it was copied from these and communicated to men. It appears moreover that the whole of the divine teachings had not been openly published to the people of Israel, many of them having been communicated to the patriarchs only in secret books which were transmitted by them to later generations.

Notwithstanding its many salient features of a characteristic nature, it is still difficult to say amid what circles the book had its origin. Jellinek regards it as an Essenian work of an anti-Pharisaic tendency. But although a good many things in it, such as its highly developed angelology, its secret books, its doctrine of the continued existence of the soul without any resurrection of the body (iii. 24), seem to favour the hypothesis of an Essenian origin, yet there are others that but the more decisively preclude such a hypothesis. It says nothing about those washings and purifications that formed so important a feature of Essenism. It is true the author strongly reprobates the eating of blood, still he by no means expresses his disapproval of animal sacrifices as was so emphatically done by the Essenes. Still less are we to think of a Samaritan origin as Beer is disposed to do, for this hypothesis again is

precluded by the fact that the author speaks of the garden of Eden, the mount of the east, Mount Sinai, and Mount Zion as being "the four places of God upon earth" (ii. 241, 251), and thus excludes Gerizim from the number. Again, Frankel's view, that the book was written by a Hellenistic Jew belonging to Egypt, is no less untenable. For, as will be seen immediately, the language in which it was originally composed was not Greek but Hebrew. There cannot be a doubt that the greater number of the peculiarities by which this book is characterized are such as it has in common with the prevailing Pharisaism of the time. And one might refer it to this without further ado were it not that several difficulties stand in the way, such as its opposition to the mode of reckoning adopted in the Pharisaic calendar (ii. 246), and its doctrine of a continued existence of the soul apart from any resurrection (ii. 24). But it would be absolutely erroneous again if, in consequence of these facts, and because of the decided prominence given to the tribe of Levi (iii. 39 sq.), we were to suppose that a Sadducee was the author of our work, for its elaborate angelology and its doctrine of immortality are of themselves sufficient to render such a supposition impossible. The truth of the matter would rather seem to be this, that the author, while of course *representing in all essential respects the standpoint of the dominant Pharisaism of his time*, gives expression to his own personal views only in connection with one or two particulars here and there (so also for example Dillmann, Rönisch, Drummond).

That the book had its origin in Palestine is already evidenced by the fact that it was *written originally in Hebrew*. For although the Ethiopic and the Latin versions have been taken from the Greek, this does not alter the fact that the original was composed in Hebrew, as is evident from explicit statements to this effect made by Jerome. The *date of the composition* of our work may be determined, if not within very narrow limits, yet with an approximate degree of certainty. For we find, on the one hand, that our author undoubtedly makes use

of, nay that he actually quotes the Book of Enoch. Then it is extremely probable, on the other, that the author of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* had our book before him when he wrote. In addition to this there is the further circumstance that we nowhere find any reference whatever to the destruction of Jerusalem; on the contrary, it is assumed throughout to be still standing as the central place of worship (comp. above all, iii. 42, 69). From all this we may venture, with tolerable probability, to refer the composition of our work to the first century of our era.

On the various titles of the book, see Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, pp. 461–482. Besides those mentioned above, we also find in Syncellus and Cedrenus the title ἀποκάλυψις Μωυσέως (Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 5 and 49; Cedrenus, ed. Bekker, i. 9).

The Ethiopic and Latin versions are both based upon a Greek text, on the former of which see Dillmann in Ewald's *Jahrbb.* iii. 88 sq., and on the latter, Rönsch, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1871, pp. 86–89. Idem, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, pp. 439–444. But, according to Jerome, we must assume that the original text was in Hebrew. It may be conjectured that the Greek version would be prepared only at a comparatively late date, say in the third century A.D., which would serve to explain how it happened that the book did not come into use in the Christian Church till the fourth century A.D.

It is obvious that in our work a liberal use is made of the Book of Enoch, nay in one passage (Ewald's *Jahrbb.* ii. 240) it is said of Enoch that: "He wrote in a book the signs of heaven in the order of their months, in order that the children of men might know the seasons of the years according to the order of the various months. . . . He saw in his dream the past and the future, what was going to happen to the sons of the children of men in their generations one after another down to the day of judgment. All this he saw and knew and wrote it down as a testimony, and left it on the earth as a testimony for all the sons of the children of men and for their generations." This and all that is said elsewhere regarding Enoch agrees entirely with the contents of our Book of Enoch. See in general, Dillmann in Ewald's *Jahrbb.* iii. 90 sq. Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, pp. 403–412.

On the allusions to our book in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, see p. 122. The quotations found in the Fathers and the Byzantine writers are collected by Fabricius in his *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 849–864, ii. 120 sq. Rönsch, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1871, p. 69 sq. Idem, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, p. 250–382.

Didymus Alex., *In epist. canonicas enarrationes*, ad 1 John iii. 12 (Gallandi, *Biblioth. patr.* vi. 300): Nam et in libro qui leprogenesis [4

leptogenesis] appellatur, ita legitur, quia Cain lapide aut ligno percusserit Abel (to which quotation Langen has drawn attention in the *Bonner Theol. Literaturbl.* 1874, p. 270).

Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxxix. 6: 'Ὡς δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἰωβηλαίοις εὑρίσκεται, τῇ καὶ λεπτῇ Γενέσει καλουμένη, καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν γυναικῶν τοῦ τε Καὶν καὶ τοῦ Σήθ ἡ βίβλος περιέχει κ.τ.λ.

Jerome, *Epist.* 78 *ad Fabiolam*, *Mansio* 18 (Vallarsi, i. 483), speaking of the name of a place called *Ressa* (רֶסָא, Num. xxxiii. 21), observes: Hoc verbum quantum memoria suggerit nusquam alibi in scripturis sanctis apud Hebraeos invenisse me novi absque libro apocrypho qui a Graecis λεπτή id est parva Genesis appellatur; ibi in aedificatione turris pro stadio ponitur, in quo exercentur pugiles et athletae et cursorum velocitas comprobatur. *Ibid.* *Mansio* 24 (Vallarsi, i. 485), speaking again of the name of a place called *Thare* (תָּרָה, Num. xxxiii. 27), observes: Hoc eodem vocabulo et iisdem literis scriptum invenio patrem Abraham, qui in supradicto apocrypho Geneseos volumine, abactis corvis, qui hominum frumenta vastabant, abactoris vel depulsoris sortitus est nomen.

In the *Decretum Gelasii* we find included among the Apocrypha a work entitled *Liber de filiabus Adae Leptogenesis* (see Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 218. Rönsch, pp. 270 sq., 477 sq.). It may be conjectured that here we have an erroneous combination of two titles belonging to two separate works. However, we can see from this as well as from the circumstance of their being a Latin version of it, that the book was also known in the West. On the indications of its having been made use of by occidental writers, see Rönsch, pp. 322–382 *passim*.

Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 5: ὡς ἐν λεπτῇ φέρεται Γενέσει, ἣν καὶ Μωϋσέως εἰναὶ Φασὶ τινες ἀποκάλυψιν. i. 7: ἐκ τῆς λεπτῆς Γενέσεως. i. 13: ἐκ τῶν λεπτῶν Γενέσεως. i. 49: ἐν τῇ Μωϋσέως λεγομένη ἀποκαλύψει. i. 183: ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσις Φησιν. i. 185: ὡς ἐν λεπτῇ κεῖται Γενέσει. i. 192: ὡς Φησιν ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσις. i. 203: ἐν λεπτῇ Γενέσει φέρεται.

Cedrenus, ed. Bekker, i. 6: καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς λεπτῆς Γενέσεως. i. 9: ὡς ἐν λεπτῇ φέρεται Γενέσει, ἣν καὶ Μωϋσέως εἰναὶ Φασὶ τινες ἀποκάλυψιν. i. 16: ὡς ἡ λεπτὴ Μωϋσέως Γένεσις Φησιν. i. 48: ὡς ἐπὶ τῇ λεπτῇ κεῖται Γένεσις. i. 53: ἐν τῇ λεπτῇ Γενέσει κεῖται. i. 85: ἐν τῇ λεπτῇ Γενέσει κεῖται.

Zonaras, ed. Pinder (given in common with the two foregoing in the Bonn edition of the *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae*), vol. i. p. 18: ἐν τῇ λεπτῇ Γενέσει.

Glycas, ed. Bekker (also given in the Bonn collection), p. 198: ἡ λεγομένη λεπτὴ Γένεσις. P. 206: ἡ δὲ λεπτὴ Γένεσις λέγει. P. 392: ἡ δὲ λεγομένη λεπτὴ Γένεσις, οὐκ ἴδ' ὅθεν συγγραφεῖσα καὶ ὅπως, Φησιν.

The literature of our book is enumerated and considered at some length by Rönsch in *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, pp. 422–439.

Texts: *Kufälé sive Liber Jubilaeorum*, aethiopice ad duorum libror. manuscr. fidem primum, ed. Dillmann, Kiel 1859. Dillmann, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis, aus dem Aethiopischen übersetzt* (Ewald's *Jahrb. der bibl. Wissensch.* vol. ii. 1850, pp. 230–256; vol. iii. 1851, pp. 1–96). Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et profana*, vol. i. fasc. 1 (1861), pp. 15–54. Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis, unter*

Beifügungen des revidirten Textes der in der Ambrosiana aufgefundenen lateinischen Fragmente, etc. etc., erläutert untersucht und herausgegeben, Leipzig 1874.

Special disquisitions: Treuenfels, *Die kleine Genesis* (Fürst's *Literaturbl. des Orients*, 1846, Nos. 1-6; comp. vol. for 1851, No. 15), which was written before the Ethiopic text was discovered. Jellinek, *Ueber das Buch der Jubiläen und das Noach-Buch*, Leipzig 1855 (reprinted from part 3 of the *Bet ha-Midrash*). Beer, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und sein Verhältniss zu den Midraschim*, Leipzig 1856. Idem, *Noch ein Wort über das Buch der Jubiläen*, Leipzig 1857. Frankel, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums*, 1856, pp. 311-316, 380-400. Dillmann, *Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch.* xi. 1857, pp. 161-163. Krüger, "Die Chronologie im Buch der Jubiläen" (*Zeitschr. der DMG.* vol. xii. 1858, pp. 279-299). Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina* (1866), pp. 84-102. Rubin, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis in's Hebräische übersetzt, mit einer Einleitung und mit Noten versehen*, Wien, Beck's Univ.-Buchhandlung, 1870. Ginsburg, art. "Jubilees, Book of," in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*. Rönsch, *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1871, pp. 60-98. Idem, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, Leipzig 1874. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1874, pp. 435-441. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah* (1877), pp. 143-147. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften A.T.'s*, § 571. Dillmann, *Beiträge aus dem Buch der Jubiläen zur Kritik des Pentateuch-Textes* (*Transactions of the Berlin Academy*, 1883, pp. 323-340). Idem, in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 364 sq.

2. *The Martyrdom of Isaiah.*

An apocryphal work containing an account of the martyrdom of Isaiah is repeatedly mentioned by Origen. He simply calls it an *ἀπόκρυφον*, tells us nothing of its contents beyond the statement that Isaiah had been sawn asunder, and plainly describes it as a *Jewish* production. Again in the *Constitutiones apostol.* reference is made merely in a general way to an Apocryphum 'Hσαίου. On the other hand, in the list of the canon edited by Montfaucon, Pitra, and others there is a more precise mention of a 'Hσαίου ὄρασις (see p. 127). Epiphanius knows of *ἡ ἀναβατικὸν 'Hσαίου*, which was in use among the Archontics and the Hieracites. Jerome speaks of an *Ascensio Isaiae*. It is extremely probable that these references are not all to one and the same work, that, on the contrary, Origen had in view a purely Jewish production, while the others referred to a Christian version of it, or to

some Christian work quite independent of it. For there exists a Christian Apocryphum on Isaiah which, at all events, is made up of a variety of elements, though the oldest of them may be pretty clearly seen to be a Jewish *history of the martyrdom of Isaiah*. This Apocryphum, like so many others, has come down to us in its entirety only in an Ethiopic version, and was published for the first time by Laurence (1819). The second half of it is likewise extant in an old Latin version, which was printed at Venice in 1522, but had long disappeared until it was brought to light again by Gieseler (1832). This whole material, accompanied with valuable disquisitions and elucidations, has been embodied in Dillmann's edition (*Ascensio Isaiae*, Lips. 1877). Lastly, Gebhardt published (1878) a Greek text, which however does not profess to be the original book, but an adaptation of it in the shape of a Christian legend of the saints.

The contents of the whole work, as given in the Ethiopic text, are as follows: *First part*: the martyrdom (chaps. i.-v.). Isaiah intimates to Hezekiah the future impiety of his son Manasseh (chap. i.). After Hezekiah's death, Manasseh, as had been foretold, abandons himself entirely to the service of Satan, in consequence of which Isaiah and those of his way of thinking retire into solitude (chap. ii.). Thereupon a certain person called Balkirah complains to King Manasseh that Isaiah had been uttering prophecies against the king and the people (chap. iii. 1-12). As for Balkirah, he had been incited to this hostility to Isaiah by Satan (Beriah), who was angry at the former because he had predicted the coming redemption by Christ. Here the writer takes occasion to recount the whole history of Jesus and His Church as it had been foretold by Isaiah, and that from Christ's incarnation down to the Neronian persecution (chap. iv. 2) and the last judgment (iii. 13-iv. *fin.*). In deference to the clamours for the punishment of the prophet, Manasseh orders him to be sawn asunder, a martyr death which he bears with singular firmness (chap. v.). *Second part*: the

vision (chaps. vi.—xi.). In the twentieth year of Hezekiah's reign Isaiah sees the following vision, which he communicates to King Hezekiah and to Josab his own (the prophet's) son (chap. vi.). An angel conducts the prophet first of all through the firmament and throughout the whole six lower heavens, and shows him all that was to be seen in each of them (chaps. vii. viii.). At last they reach the seventh heaven, where Isaiah sees all the righteous that have died from Adam downwards, and then he sees God the Lord Himself (chap. ix.). After having heard God the Father giving to his Son Jesus Christ His commission to descend into the world, Isaiah comes back again to the firmament accompanied by the angel (chap. x.). Here there is revealed to him the future birth of Jesus Christ and the history of His life upon earth down to His crucifixion and resurrection, whereupon the angel returns to the seventh heaven, while Isaiah goes back to his earthly body (chap. xi.).

This outline of the contents of our book will suffice to show that here we have to do with two elements of a totally distinct and dissimilar nature. There is no connection whatever between the vision and the martyrdom. Not only so, the vision is with singular awkwardness made to follow the martyrdom which, in the order of time, it should of course have preceded. Nor does the martyrdom again form one connected whole. Above all is the whole passage iii. 13—v. 1, which interrupts and disturbs the connection, obviously to be regarded as a later interpolation, as is also the kindred passage in the second part, xi. 2—22. And lastly, the introduction again has only an apparent connection with what follows. On closer examination we find reason to suspect that in all probability that introduction was inserted at some subsequent period. On the strength of these facts Dillmann has propounded the following hypotheses regarding the origin of our book. In the first place we are to distinguish two elements that are independent of each other. (1) The account of the martyrdom of Isaiah, chaps. ii. 1—iii. 12, and v. 2—14, which is of Jewish

origin; and (2) the vision of Isaiah, chaps. vi.-xi. (exclusive of xi. 2-22), which is of Christian origin. Then we are to regard these two elements (3) as having been amalgamated by a Christian who at the same time composed and inserted the introduction (chap. i.). Lastly, when the work had assumed this shape, another Christian would afterwards insert the two sections (chaps. iii. 13-v. 1, and xi. 2-22). These conjectures may at least be regarded as extremely probable. They are borne out not only by the internal indications already referred to, but by external testimony as well. In the free version of the whole book edited by Gebhardt no trace is to be met with of sections iii. 13-v. 1 and xi. 2-22. Besides this latter section (xi. 2-22) does not occur in the Latin version, which, as has been previously observed, embraces only chaps. vi.-xi. It is evident therefore that the sections in question must be later interpolations. But the circumstance that the vision and the vision alone is all that has come down to us in the Latin version, goes to confirm the assumption that this vision of itself originally formed an independent whole. By the *ὄρασις*, the *ἀναβατικόν*, *ascensio Isaiae* mentioned by the Fathers, we have therefore to understand merely that visionary journey of Isaiah through the seven heavens which had been composed by some Christian or another. In the case of Origen however it is the Jewish account of the *martyrdom* of Isaiah (chaps. ii. 1-iii. 12 and v. 2-14) that is in view. This latter is simply a legendary story composed for the purpose of glorifying the prophet. It contains nothing of an apocalyptic character, and consequently does not belong to the category of prophetic pseudepigraphs, but to that of legendary works.

The story of the *sawing asunder of Isaiah* is mentioned by writers of so early a date as Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.* chap. cxx.; Tertullian, *De patientia*, chap. xiv.; *Scorpiace*, chap. viii. (comp. Div. ii. vol. i. p. 345). It is probably this too that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has in view in chap. xi. 37. In so far as it is probable that the reference here is to our book, so far have we at the same time a clue to the date of the composition of that Epistle.

Origen, *Epist. ad Africanum*, chap. ix. (de la Rue, i. 19 sq.; Lommatsch.

xvii. 51). With the view of proving that the Jewish authorities had suppressed everything that represented them in an unfavourable light, some specimens of which have nevertheless come down to us in apocryphal writings (ὡς τινα σώζεται ἐν ἀποκρύφοις), Origen proceeds as follows: Καὶ τούτου παράδειγμα δώσομεν τὰ περὶ τὸν Ἡσαΐαν ἱστορούμενα, καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς μαρτυρούμενα, ἐν οὐδενὶ τῶν φανερῶν βιβλίων γεγραμμένα (here follows the quotation Heb. xi. 37). . . . Σαφές δ' ὅτι αἱ παραδόσεις λέγουσι πεπρίσθαι Ἡσαΐαν τὸν προφῆτην καὶ ἐν τινὶ ἀποκρύφῳ τοῦτο φέρεται ὅπερ τάχα ἐπίτηδες ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων βεβαδιούργηται, λέξεις τινὰς τὰς μὴ πρεπούσας παρεμβεβληκτῶν τῇ γραφῇ, ἵν' ἡ ὅλη ἀπιστηθῇ.

Origen, *Ad Matth.* xiii. 57 (de la Rue, iii. 465; Lommatzsch, iii. 49): Καὶ Ἡσαΐας δὲ πεπρίσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ ἱστούρηται· εἰ δέ τις οὐ προσέται τὴν ἱστορίαν διὰ τὸ ἐν τῷ ἀποκρύφῳ Ἡσαΐα αὐτὴν φέρεσθαι, πιστευσάτω τοῖς ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους οὕτω γεγραμμένοις (Heb. xi. 37).

Origen, *Ad Matth.* xxiii. 37 (de la Rue, iii. 848; Lommatzsch, iv. 237 sq.): Propterea videndum, ne forte oporteat ex libris secretioribus, qui apud Judaeos feruntur, ostendere verbum Christi et non solum Christi, sed etiam discipulorum ejus. . . . Fertur ergo in scripturis non manifestis serratum esse Jesaiam, etc.

Origen, *In Jesaiam homil.* i. 5 (de la Rue, 108; Lommatzsch, xiii. 245 sq.) Ajunt [Judaei] ideo Isaiam esse sectum a populo quasi legem praevaricantem et extra scripturas annuntiantem. Scriptura enim dicit: "nemo videbit faciem meam et vivet." Iste vero ait: "vidi Dominum Sabaoth." Moses, ajunt, non vidit et tu vidisti? Et propter hoc eum secuerunt et condemnaverunt eum ut impium. And this is precisely as the affair is represented in our book, chap. iii. 8 sqq.

Epiphanius, *Haer.* xl. 2 (speaking of the Archontics): λαμβάνουσι ἡ λάβας ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναβατικοῦ Ἡσαΐα, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν ἀποκρύφων. Idem, *Haer.* lxvii. 3: βούλεται δὲ [scil. Hierakas] τὴν τελείαν αὐτοῦ σύστασιν ποιῆσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναβατικοῦ Ἡσαΐου, ὁθεν ὡς ἐν τῷ ἀναβατικῷ λεγομένῳ ἔλεγεν ἐκείσε (here follows a quotation which substantially coincides with a passage in chap. ix. of our book).

Jerome, *Comm. in Isaiam*, chap. lxiv. 3 [al. lxiv. 4] (Vallarsi, iv. 761): Ascensio enim Isaiae et apocalypsis Eliae hoc habent testimonium, namely, the passage 1 Cor. ii. 9. With regard to the *Apocalypsis Eliae*, see p. 129. The passage actually occurs in the *Latin* text of the *Ascensio Isaiae*. It is wanting, however, in the *Ethiopic*, and so is obviously an interpolation.

Jerome, *Comm. in Isaiam*, chap. lvii. fin. (Vallarsi, iv. 666): Judaei arbitratur . . . Isaiam de sua prophetare morte quod serrandus sit a Manasse serra lignea, quae apud eos certissima traditio est.

On the patristic quotations, comp. also Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 1086–1100.

The *Ethiopic* text was published by Laurence, accompanied with a Latin and English version (*Ascensio Isaiae vatis, opusculum pseudepigraphum, cum versione Latina Anglicanaque publici juris factum*, Oxoniae 1819). Mai (*Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, vol. iii. 2, 1828, p. 238 sq.) published two fragments of an old Latin version, viz. chaps. ii. 14–iii. 13 and vii. 1–19, without being aware that they formed part of our Apocryphum. After

Niebuhr had discovered the source from which they came they were fully discussed by Nitzsch (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 209 sqq.). The old Latin version of the *Visio* (chaps. vi.-xi. of the Ethiopic text), which had been printed at Venice in 1522, and had then disappeared for a long time, was found again and reprinted by Gieseler in a Göttingen program (*Vetus translatio latina visionis Jesaiae*, etc., Götting. 1832). The Latin version of Laurence, accompanied with the old Latin texts, was also reprinted by Gfrörer, *Prophetæ veteres pseudepigraphi*, Stuttg. 1840. A German version of those texts was published by Jolowicz (*Die Himmelfahrt und Vision des Propheten Jesaja, aus dem Aethiopischen* [or as it should rather have been? *aus Laurence' lateinischer Uebersetzung*] und *Lateinischen in's Deutsche übersetzt*, Leipzig 1854). A critical edition of the Ethiopic text, along with an amended translation, and containing also the old Latin versions, was issued by Dillmann (*Ascensio Isaiae, Aethiopice et Latine cum prolegomenis, adnotationibus criticis et exegeticis, additis versionum Latinarum reliquiis edita*, Lips. 1877). Gebhardt published a Greek text, in which we have a free version of the whole book, framed in the style of the later Christian legends of the saints (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, 1878, pp. 330-353).

Special disquisitions: Gesenius, *Commentar über den Jesaja*, vol. i. 1821, p. 45 sqq. Nitzsch, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, pp. 209-246. Gieseler, *Göttinger Progr.* 1832 (see above). Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, 1838, i. p. 65 sqq. A. G. Hoffmann, art. "Jesajas," in Ersch and Gruber's *Allg. Encycl.* sec. ii. vol. xv. (1838) pp. 387-390. Lücke, *Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes*, 2nd ed. 1852, pp. 274-302. Bleek, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, pp. 994-998. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Neuen Testaments*, sec. 274. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vii. 369-373. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina* (1866), pp. 157-167. Dillmann in his edition (1877). Idem, in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vol. xii. 359 sq. Renan, *L'église chrétienne* 1879), p. 528 sq.

3. The Lost Legendary Works.

In a manner similar to that which we have just seen exemplified in the case of Isaiah, pretty nearly the whole of the prominent personages belonging to the hallowed days of old were laid hold of by the legendary spirit for the purpose of throwing around them a halo of glory. The plain narratives of Holy Scripture were far too simple and unadorned to satisfy the tastes and the needs of later times. A desire was manifested to know more about those men, above all to know something regarding them of a more piquant and edifying character than was furnished by the canonical records. Accordingly we find that it is the lives of the three great heroes, Adam the progenitor of the human race, Abraham the father of Israel, and Moses

the great lawgiver, that have been most elaborately embellished by fictitious legends. And there are many other men of God besides whose lives have been subjected to a similar treatment (comp. in general vol. i. Div. ii. p. 341 et seq.). Then *Christians* have laid hold of the existing *Jewish* legends, and elaborated them with equal, nay if possible with greater zeal. Consequently, as in the case of the Apocalypses so also here, we often find it impossible to distinguish with any certainty between what is Jewish and what is Christian. The foundations of the legends themselves are in most cases undoubtedly Jewish. But it is not improbable that the earliest *writings* of this class are also to be ascribed to Jewish authors. This holds true above all of the three great founders of new epochs, Adam, Abraham and Moses, to whom therefore we will here confine ourselves.

1. *Books of Adam.* A variety of tolerably voluminous *Christian* works on the life of Adam have come down to us, an Ethiopic one, a Syriac one, another in Syriac and Arabic, one in Greek, and another in Latin. Although the whole of these are unquestionably of Christian origin, and although there is not one of them that can be regarded as based upon a Jewish original, still it is probable that they have drawn upon Jewish material. A *Jewish Book of Adam* is mentioned in the Talmud. The *Constitutiones apostol.* vi. 16 mention an apocryphal 'Αδάμ along with the Apocrypha bearing the names of Moses, Enoch and Isaiah. Again, in the list of the Apocrypha published by Montfaucon, Pitra and others, 'Αδάμ finds a place among the rest of the Jewish Apocrypha (see p. 126). Indeed at an early period there already existed Gnostic ἀποκαλύψεις τοῦ 'Αδάμ (Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxvi. 8). In the *Decretum Gelasii* there occurs a Liber, qui appellatur Poenitentia Adae (Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 219).

Editions of the Christian books of Adam: (1) Dillmann published a German translation of an *Ethiopic Book of Adam* (Ewald's *Jabrb. der bibl. Wissensch.* vol. v. 1853, pp. 1-144). The Ethiopic text was published

by Trumpp (*Transactions of the Akademie der Wissensch. of Münich*, philosopho-philol. department, vol. xv. 1879-1881), and an English version by Malan (*Book of Adam and Eve, also called the Conflict of Adam and Eve with Satan, translated from the Ethiopic*, London 1882). (2) Akin to the above and, if we are to believe Dillmann, possessing a greater claim to originality, is a Syriac work, entitled "the treasure hole" (*i.e.* the hole in which the treasures of Paradise were kept), which as yet is known only through a German version published by Bezold (*Die Schatzhöhle, aus dem syr. Texte dreier unedirter Handschriften in's Deutsche übersetzt*, Leipzig 1883). (3) Another Syriac and Arabic work entitled, "The Testament of Adam," has been published by Renan, in the Syriac text accompanied with a French translation (*Journal asiatique*, fifth series, vol. ii. 1853, pp. 427-71). (4) Tischendorf published a Greek Book of Adam under the title *Apocalypsis Mosis* (*Apocalypses apocryphae*, Lips. 1866), and which was also published by Ceriani (*Monum. sacra et prof.* v. 1). On this comp. p. 81. (5) Nearly allied to this Greek work, in fact to some extent identical with it, is the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae*, published by Wilh. Meyer (*Transactions of the Munich Academy*, philos.-philol. department, vol. xiv. 1878).

Comp. in general Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 1-94, ii. 1-43. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, 1832, p. 128 sq. (the Rabbinical quotations here). Dukes in Fürst's *Literaturbl. des Orients*, 1849, coll. 76-78. Comp. also *ibid.* 1850, pp. 705 sqq., 732 sqq. Lücke, *Einkl. in die Offenbarung des Johannes*, 2nd ed. p. 232. Hort, art. "Adam, Books of," in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. i. 1877, pp. 34-39. Renan, *L'église chrétienne* (1879), p. 529 sq. Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 366 sq.

2. *Abraham*. A short apocryphal book of Ἀβραάμ (consisting of 300 verses) occurs in the Stichometry of Nicephorus and the *Synopsis Athanasii* (see p. 125). And as in these lists it is found in the very heart of the Jewish Apocrypha, it is of course a different book from that of the ἀποκάλυψις Ἀβραάμ which was in use among the Sethites (Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxxix. 5). On the other hand, it is no doubt the former of these that Origen has in view in the case of those statements regarding Abraham which he borrows from a certain apocryphal work.

Origen, *In Lucam homil.* xxxv. *init.* (de la Rue, iii. 973; Lommatzsch, v. 217): Legimus, si tamen cui placet hujusmodi scripturam recipere, justitiae et iniquitatis angelos super Abrahami salute et interitu disceptantes dum utraeque turmae suo eum volunt coetui vindicare.

Comp. also Lücke, *Einkl. in die Offenb. Joh.* p. 232; and for the Abrahamic legend generally, see vol. i. Div. ii. p. 343; and Fabricius, *Cod.*

pseudepigr. i. pp. 341–428, ii. p. 81 sq. B. Beer, *Leben Abrahams nach Auffassung der jüdischen Sage*, Leipzig 1859.

3. *Moses and his time.* The apocryphal literature regarding Moses himself has been already considered at p. 80. But among the books referring both to himself and his time there is still another work to be mentioned, the theme of which was a single episode in the lawgiver's life, we mean the Book of *Jannes and Jambres*, the two Egyptian magicians who, according to Ex. vii. 8 sqq., wrought miracles before Pharaoh equal to those of Moses and Aaron, but were nevertheless beaten in the end. The names are not mentioned in the Old Testament, but they occur at a comparatively early date in the legends, and they were known not only in Jewish, but in Gentile and Christian circles as well, as the names of the two famous Egyptian magicians in question. The orthography fluctuates exceedingly. In the Greek texts the prevailing spelling is *Ἰαννῆς καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς*, as in the Targum of Jonathan it is יַנִּים וַיִּמְרִים. In the Talmud, on the other hand, we find יוחנני וממרא (Jochane and Mamre), while in the Latin texts the names are almost uniformly spelt Jannes (or Jamnes) et Mambres. What the original spelling was it is difficult to determine. In any case the names appear to be of Semitic origin (see Steiner in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* iii. 189; Riehm's *Wörterb.* p. 665 sq.; Orelli in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* vi. 478 sq.). The book written about the magicians in question is mentioned by Origen, and in the *Decretum Gelasii*. As the name of Jannes was known even to so early a writer as Pliny, and as it is probable that those anonymous personages owed their name and individuality first of all to the apocryphal book itself, we may perhaps venture to refer the date of the composition of this work to pre-Christian times.

For the *Rabbinical passages* referring to Jannes and Jambres, see Buxtorf's *Lex. Chald.* col. 945–947. Schoettgen, *Horae hebr.* note on 2 Tim. iii. 8. Wetstein, *Nov. Test.* note on same passage. Levy, *Chald. Wörterb.* i. 337. Idem, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* ii. 226. The form יוחנני וממרא is found in *Menachoth* lxxv.^a; יַנִּים וַיִּמְרִים in the Targum of Jonathan on Ex. i. 15,

vii. 11; Num. xxii. 22; and also יִנּוֹם וְיֹמְבְרוֹס (Jonos and Jombros) in the *Tanachuma* and *Sohar*.

Of heathen writers Pliny and Apuleius are acquainted with Jannes, while the neo-Platonist Numenius knows both Jannes and Jambres. (1) Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxx. 1. 11: Est et alia magices factio a Mose et Janne et Lotape ac Judaeis pendens, sed multis milibus annorum post Zoroastren. (2) Apuleius, *Apolog.* (or *De magia*) chap. xc. ed. Hildebrand: Ego ille sim Carinondas vel Damigeron vel is Moses vel Jannes vel Apollonius vel ipse Dardanus, vel quicumque alius post Zoroastren et Hostanen inter magos celebratus est. (3) Numenius in Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* ix. 8: Τὰ δ' ἐξῆς Ἰαννῆς καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς Αἰγύπτιοι ἱερογραμματεῖς, ἄνδρες οὐδένης ἡττους μαγεύσαι κριθέντες εἶναι, ἐπὶ Ἰουδαίων ἐξελαυνομένων ἐξ Αἰγύπτου. Μουσαίῳ γοῦν τῷ Ἰουδαίων ἐξηγηταμένῳ, ἀνδρὶ γενομένῳ θεῷ εὐξασθαι δυνατωτάτῳ, οἱ παραστήναι ἀξιοθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τοῦ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων οὔτοι ἦσαν, τῶν τε συμφορῶν ὥς ὁ Μουσαῖος ἐπήγε τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ, τὰς νεανικωτάτας αὐτῶν ἐπιλύεισθαι ὥφθησαν δυνατοί. In view of this passage Origen, *Contra Celsum*, iv. 51, says with regard to Numenius that: Ἐκτίθεται καὶ τὴν περὶ Μωϋσέως καὶ Ἰαννοῦ καὶ Ἰαμβροῦ ἱστορίαν. Owing to the circumstance that the term Μουσαῖος, which is here used for Moses, is precisely the same as that employed by the Hellenist Artapan, Freudenthal (*Alexander Polyhistor*. 1875, p. 173) is disposed to think that the story is borrowed from Artapan, and that he is the author of the legend. But this argument however cannot be regarded as conclusive. Then the names of the magicians, which in all probability are Semitic, seem rather to point to a Palestinian origin.

Then passing within the pale of Christianity the passage that first claims attention is 2 Tim. iii. 8: ὃν τρόπον δὲ Ἰαννῆς καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς ἀντίστησαν Μωϋσεί. Further, among Greek authors we may mention *Evang. Nicodemi* (= *Acta Pilati*), chap. v.; *Constitut. apostol.* viii. 1, and subsequent Fathers; but above all the hagiologist Palladius, who relates in his *Historia Lausiaca* (written about 420 A.D., see Fabricius-Harles, *Bibl. graec.* x. 98 sqq.) that Macarius visited the κηποτάφιον, which Jannes and Jambres had erected for themselves, and that he had an interview with the demons that had their abode there (see the passage in Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* ii. 106–111). Latin writers: The Latin text of the *Evang. Nicodemi* (= *Gesta Pilati*), chap. v.; *Abdiae hist. apostol.* vi. 15 (in Fabricius, *Cod. apocr. Nov. Test.* i. 622). Cyprian, *De unitate ecclesiae*, chap. xvi. The Latin translator of Origen in the passages to be quoted below. The *Decretum Gelasii* (in Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanon's*, p. 220) and subsequent Fathers. The Latin writers as well as the Western authorities for the text of 2 Tim. iii. 8 (*Cod. FG* and the text of the Itala) read Jannes (or Jamnes) et Mambres almost uniformly. See the various readings in connection with 2 Tim. iii. 8 in the critical editions of the New Testament; also Thilo, *Cod. apocr. Nov. Test.* p. 553, and the earlier literature given there. As the Talmud adopts the spelling מַמְרַא, Westcott and Hort are warranted in observing, as they do in the note on 2 Tim. iii. 8 in their edition of the New Testament, that “the Western text probably derived Μαμβρῆς from a Palestinian source.”

The Book of Jannes and Jambres (or Mambres) is mentioned: (1) By

Origen, *Ad Matth.* xxvii. 9 (de la Rue, iii. 916; Lommatzsch, v. 29): Quod ait, "sicut Jannes et Mambres restiterunt Mosi" non invenitur in publicis scripturis, sed in libro secreto, qui suprascribitur: Jannes et Mambres liber. (2) Again Origen, *Ad Matth.* xxiii. 37 (de la Rue, iii. 848; Lommatzsch, iv. 239), quotes 2 Tim. iii. 8: "sicut Jannes et Mambres restiterunt Mosi sic et isti resistunt veritati," as evidence that apocryphal writings are sometimes referred to in the New Testament. Nec enim scimus in libris canonizatis historiam de Janne et Mambre resistentibus Mosi. (3) It is also mentioned in the *Decretum Gelasii* (in Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanon's*, p. 220): Liber, qui appellatur Poenitentia Jamnis et Mambre, apocryphus.

Comp. in general: Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 813-825, ii. 105-111. Suicer, *Thesaurus*, under 'Ιαννης. Wolf, *Curæ philol. in Nov. Test.* note on 2 Tim. iii. 8; and the commentaries generally on this passage. J. G. Michaelis, *De Janne et Jambre famosis Aegyptiorum magis*, Hal. 1747 The lexicons to the New Testament and the Bible Dictionaries of Winer, Schenkel, and Riehm. Rud. Hofmann, *Das Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen* (1851), p. 352 sq. Orelli in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vi. 478 sq. Dillmann, *ibid.* xii. 365. Holtzmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (1880), p. 140 sq. Heath in *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement* 1881, pp. 311-317.

Whatever other works based on Biblical legends were in use in the early Church are either entirely unknown to us (such for example as the Book of *Λάμειχ*, quoted in the list of the Apocrypha edited by Montfaucon and Pitra, see p. 126), or they may, without hesitation, be regarded as Christian productions, as for instance the history of Noria the wife of Noah (Epiph. *Haer.* xxvi. 1), or the *ἀναβαθμοὶ Ἰακώβου* (Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 16), or the history of Asenath the wife of Joseph (according to Gen. xli. 45), which are still extant in various texts. What the Jewish substratum may have been in those instances it is impossible to make out with any degree of certainty, although there can scarcely be a doubt that Jewish *Books of Noah* for example were once to be met with. For further information regarding this whole literature, consult Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.*, and Dillmann, art. "Pseudepigraphen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*

VII. BOOKS OF MAGIC AND MAGICAL SPELLS.

By way of appendix to the above we may here mention further a class of literary productions which lie on the

extreme confines of *Jewish* literature, and which serve to show that the superstition that had sprung from the soil of the heathen nature-religions also continued to flourish with no little vigour among the people of Israel: we refer to the books of magic and magic spells. In the ancient world these represented the popular *arts of healing*. As even in our own day Christians are often met with who prefer the quack doctor to the skilled physician, so in the ancient world, at least in that part of it that was under the influence of the East, there was often a tendency to have recourse to the *magician* and the *exorcist* rather than to the regular doctor in every sort of ailment. It is interesting in this connection to hear for example what Celsus says about the Egyptians (in Origen, *Contra Cels.* viii. 58): "That some (higher) being or other controls things of even the most trifling nature, may be learnt from what is alleged by the Egyptians, who tell us that thirty-six (or as others affirm, a good many more) demons or divinities of the air have allotted among themselves the human body, which is supposed to be divided into a corresponding number of parts, and that each has taken one of these parts under his own peculiar charge. And they know the names of the demons in their native tongue, such as Chnumen and Chachumen and Knat and Sikat and Biu and Eru and Erebut and Ramanor and Reinanoor, or whatever else they may be called. By invoking these they cure the ailments of the different members of the body." What Celsus here alleges with respect to the Egyptians is confirmed *mutatis mutandis* by hundreds of testimonies in regard to the rest of the ancient world as well. Magic and exorcism, and that above all for curative purposes, were uncommonly popular and prevalent throughout the entire Roman Empire. Nor did the *Jewish people* form an exception. We know from the Old and New Testaments as well as from Josephus how extensively the various forms of magic prevailed also among them. In later times *Solomon* was regarded as being above all the author of this art (on the strength of 1 Kings v. 12, 13). Josephus

informs us that this monarch composed and bequeathed to posterity certain incantations by means of which demons could be restrained and so effectually expelled that they would never re-enter the man again. By way of showing the efficacy of those incantations he tells a very amusing story about a Jew of the name of Eleazar who, on one occasion and in presence of Vespasian and his sons and several Roman officers, drew out a demon through the demoniac's nose by holding a magic ring under this organ and, repeating at the same time the incantations of Solomon, forbade him ever to enter again. At length, to prove that the demon was actually expelled, he ordered this latter to overturn a vessel of water that was near at hand, which order was at once complied with (Joseph. *Antt.* viii. 2. 5). From the way in which Josephus speaks of the Solomonic incantations we feel constrained to assume that they must have been embodied in special books. Origen distinctly alleges as much. Those books survived, although only after having undergone a variety of adaptations, till far on into the Middle Ages. We still hear of one of the name of Aaron being at the court of Manuel Comnenus, and who was in possession of a βίβλον Σολομώντειον by means of which whole legions of demons could be exorcised. This literature also found its way into Christian circles. The *Decretum Gelasii* knows of a *Contradictio Salomonis*, while a Christian *Testamentum Salomonis* is still extant. And it is through popular Christian works of this sort, that the knowledge of the efficacy of Solomon's magic spells has come down to more modern times and found its way into Goethe's *Faust* (the exorcising of the poodle: "Für solche halbe Höllenbrut Ist Salomonis Schlüssel gut").

Official Judaism did not of course quite approve of those books of magic, although the Babylonian Talmud itself is full of superstition. According to a tradition, which is found both in the Mishna and in certain Byzantine writers (Suidas, Glycas), we learn that the pious king Hezekiah ordered the

suppression of Solomon's "Book of Cures," because the people trusted it so much that they neglected to pray to God.

On the subject of magic in *the ancient world generally*, an abundant store of material is to be found in Georgii's art. "Magia," in Pauly's *Real-Encyc. der class. Alterthumswissensch.* iv. 1377-1418. On the same *among the Jews*, see the article "Zauberei," in the Bible dictionaries of Winer, Schenkel, and Riehm. On this subject in Talmudic Judaism again, see Brecher, *Das Transcendentale, Magie und magische Heilarten im Talmud*, Wien 1850. Joel, *Der Aberglaube und die Stellung des Judenthums zu demselben*, 1st part, Breslau 1881.

On Solomon, see Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 1032-1063. The *Crypta ubi Salomon daemones torquebat* were still seen at Jerusalem by the pilgrim of Bordeaux in the fourth century A.D. (Tobler, *Palaestinae descriptiones*, 1869, p. 3).

Joseph. *Antt.* viii. 2. 5: 'Ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ συνταξάμενος αἷς παρηγορεῖται τὰ νοσήματα, τρόπους ἐξορκώσεων κατέλιπεν, οἷς ἐνδύμενα τὰ δαιμόνια ὡς μηκέτ' ἵπανελθεῖν ἐκδιώκουσι κ.τ.λ. (here follows the story about Eleazar, referred to above).

Origen, *Ad. Matth.* xxvi. ☩ (de la Rue, iii. 910; Lommatzsch, v. 7): Quæret aliquis, si convenit vel daemones adjurare; et qui respicit ad multos, qui talia facere ausi sunt, dicet non sine ratione fieri hoc. Qui autem adspicit Jesum imperantem daemonibus, sed etiam potestatem dantem discipulis suis super omnia daemonia, et ut infirmitates sanarent, dicet quoniam non est secundum potestatem datam a Salvatore, adjurare daemonia; Judaicum est enim. Hoc etsi aliquando a nostris tale aliquid, fiat, simile fit ei, quod a Salomone scriptis adjurationibus solent daemones adjurari. Sed ipsi, qui utuntur adjurationibus illis, aliquoties nec idoneis constitutis libris utuntur; quibusdam autem et de Hebraeo acceptis adjurant daemonia.

On the *βίβλον Σολομώντιον* of Aaron in the time of Manuel Comnenus, see the passage from Nicetas Choniates quoted in Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* i. 1037 sq.

Decretum Gelasii (in Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 224), § 61: Scriptura quæ appellatur Contradictio Salomonis, apocr. *Ibid.* § 62: Philacteria omnia quæ non angelorum, ut illi confingunt, sed daemonum magis conscripta sunt nominibus apocr.

The Christian *Testamentum Salomonis* was published by Fleck, *Wissenschaftl. Reise durch Deutschland, Italien*, etc. vol. ii. 3 (1837), pp. 111-140. Also in Fürst's *Orient*, vols. v. and vii. A German translation was contributed by Bornemann (*Zeitschr. für die histor. Theol.* 1844, iii. pp. 9-56). Comp. also Bornemann, *Conjectanea in Salomonis Testamentum* (*Biblische Studien von Geistlichen des Königr. Sachsen*, second year 1843, pp. 45-60, for fourth year 1846, pp. 28-69). With regard to the date of its composition, comp. the passage from Leontius as given in Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* i. 1063 sq. In how strange a manner Jewish-Christian and heathen elements were all mixed up with each other may be seen for

example from two Greek manuscripts containing magical treatises which were published by Parthey (*Transactions of the Berlin Academy*, 1865).

Mishna, *Pesachim* iv. 9: "Hezekiah concealed the book of cures (ספר רפואות), and the learned approved of this." Comp. the commentary of Maimonides on this in Surenhusius's *Mishna* ii. 150, where it is expressly stated that the tradition had in view Solomon's Book of Cures. Suidas (Lex. under 'Εζεκίας): Ἦν Σολομῶνι βιβλος ἰαμάτων πάθους παντός, ἡγεκο-
λαμμένη τῇ τοῦ ναοῦ φλιᾶ. Ταύτην ἐξεκόλαψεν Ἐζεκίας, οὐ προσέχοντος τοῦ
λαοῦ τῷ θεῷ διὰ τὸ τὰς θεραπειὰς τῶν παθῶν ἐνθένδε τοὺς πάσχοντας αὐτοὺς
κερμίζεσθαι, περιωρῶντας αἰτεῖν τὸν θεόν. Glycas in Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.*
i. 1042 sq.

§ 33. THE GRAECO-JEWISH LITERATURE.

Preliminary Remarks.

STILL more varied than the Palestinian-Jewish is the Graeco-Jewish literature. Scriptural and Rabbinic Judaism on the one hand, Greek philosophers, poets and historians on the other, form the factors, through whose co-operation a literature of the most motley and varied character sprang up upon the soil of the Jewish Dispersion; a literature many-sided with respect not only to its forms, but also to the standpoints taken up by its authors and the objects they pursued.

Hellenistic Judaism and its literature partake of the general intellectual and literary character of the period, viz. of that *Alexandrino-Roman epoch of Greek literature*, during which the latter left the soil of Greek nationality and became a universal literature.¹ For the nations of the Mediterranean region did not merely assimilate Greek culture, but also contributed on their part to the literary productivity of the age. In all lands authors made their appearance, whose Greek education prepared them to participate in every kind of literary effort, and whose co-operation imparted to Greek literature a cosmopolitan character; cosmopolitan in the twofold respect of origin and effect. The tide of the mental acquisitions of the East now flowed in increasingly upon Greek literature. Religion and philosophy received thence fresh impulses, poets and historians fresh material. And on the other hand the effect aimed at

¹ On its characteristics, comp. Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüd.-alexandr. Religionsphilosophie*, i. 1-15. Bernhardt, *Grundriss der griechischen Literatur*, vol. i. (4th edit. 1876) pp. 498-577. Volkmann, art. "Alexandriner," in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* i. 1 (2nd edit.), pp. 743-753 (where other literature is also given). Nicolai, *Griech. Literaturgeschichte*, vol. ii. (1876) p. 80 sq.

was also cosmopolitan, for they, who now took pen in hand, wrote not only for the little nation of the Greeks, but for the educated classes throughout the world.

In this literary productivity Hellenized Jews also took a part. And what has just been said applies to them above all others, viz. that they introduced a new element into Greek literature. The religious knowledge of Israel, which had hitherto been the possession of only a small circle, now brought its influence to bear in the department of Greek literature. The religious faith of Israel, its history and its great and sacred past, were depicted in the forms and with the means furnished by the literary culture of the Greeks, and thus made accessible to the whole world. Such Jews wrote not only for their compatriots and co-religionists, but for the purpose of making known to all mankind the illustrious history of Israel and its pre-eminent religious enlightenment.

The connection between their own national culture and that of the Greeks was of course, in the case of the Jews as well as of other Orientals, no merely external one. Judaism and Hellenism now really entered upon a process of mutual internal amalgamation.² Judaism, which in its unyielding Pharisaic phase appears so rigidly exclusive, proved itself uncommonly pliable and accommodating upon the soil of Hellenism, and allowed a far-reaching influence to the ascendant Greek spirit. The Hellenistic Jews were as unwilling as others to let themselves be deprived of that common possession of the entire educated world, the great poets, philosophers and historians of Greece. They too derived from the living spring of the Greek classics that human culture, which seemed to the ancient world the supreme good. Under its influence however Judaism imperceptibly underwent a change. It stripped itself of its particularistic character. It discovered that there were true

² On Hellenistic Judaism in general, comp. Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung*, i. 15 sqq. Lutterbeck, *Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, i. 99–120. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 425–579. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 303 sqq. Siegfried, *Philo*, etc. pp. 1–27. The same, “Der jüdische Hellenismus” (*Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1875, pp. 465–489).

and Divine thoughts in the literature of the heathen world and appropriated them, it embraced all men as brethren, and desired to lead all, who were still walking in darkness, to the knowledge of the truth.

But while the Jews were thus, like other Orientals, becoming Greeks, it was at the same time seen that Judaism was something very different from the heathen religions. Its internal *power of resistance* was incomparably greater than theirs. While the other Oriental religions were merged in the general religious medley of the times, Judaism maintained itself essentially inviolate. It adhered strictly and firmly to the unity of the Godhead and the repudiation of all images in worship, and maintained the belief that God's dealings with mankind tend to a blissful end. Judaism by thus firmly adhering, in presence of the pressure exercised by Hellenism, to that which formed its essence, proved the pre-eminence of its religious strength.

The consciousness of this pre-eminence impresses its character upon the Graeco-Jewish literature. It pursues for the most part the *practical aim* of not only strengthening its co-religionists and making them acquainted with their great past, but also of convincing its non-Jewish readers of the folly of heathenism and of persuading them of the greatness of Israel's history and of the futility of all attacks upon that nation. Great part of it is therefore in the most comprehensive sense apologetic. In the predominance of the practical aim it is akin to the Palestinian. For as the latter has chiefly in view the strengthening and reviving of fidelity to the law, the Graeco-Jewish literature at least for the most part pursues the object of inspiring the non-Jewish world with respect for the people and the religion of Israel, nay if possible of bringing them to embrace the latter.

The *chief seat* of Hellenistic Judaism, and consequently of Graeco-Jewish literature, was Alexandria, the capital of the Ptolemies, which through their exertions had been raised to the first rank as a place of scholarship in the Hellenistic period.

The means of culture afforded by the age were here at disposal in a profusion not to be found elsewhere; while at the same time Jews were nowhere else found living together in so great numbers out of Palestine. Hence there was an inward necessity that Hellenic Judaism should here reach its utmost prosperity, and its literature be here chiefly cultivated. But it would be a mistake to suppose that such pursuits were cultivated *only* in Alexandria. They were indeed by no means specifically "Alexandrine," but the common possession of Hellenistic, that is extra-Palestinian Judaism in general. Nay even in Palestine they found advocates, although the Maccabean movement opposed a strong barrier to the encroachments of this tendency.³

The diversity both in literary form and theological standpoint of the works now to be discussed is chiefly dependent on their greater adherence, now to scriptural types, now to Greek models. Between the two extremes here mentioned however are found a great variety of productions, which it is difficult to subject to definite classification. The following groups may perhaps be most fitly distinguished.

I. TRANSLATIONS OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

1. *The Septuagint.*

The foundation of all Judæo-Hellenistic culture is the ancient anonymous Greek translation of the Scriptures, known by the name of the *Septuagint* (οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα, septuaginta interpretes), and preserved entire by the tradition of the Christian Church; Hellenistic Judaism is as inconceivable without it as the evangelical Church of Germany without Luther's translation of the Bible.⁴

³ Comp. on Hellenistic Judaism in Palestine, especially Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor* (1875), pp. 127-129.

⁴ The name "Septuagint" referred in the first place to the translation of the Pentateuch, but was afterwards transferred to the other books also.

The single name must not mislead us to the notion, that we have here to deal with a single work *not only the work of different authors, but the work also of different times* being subsequently comprised under this name. The oldest part is the translation of *the Pentateuch*, of the origin of which the so-called Epistle of Aristeas gives a detailed narrative. King Ptolemy II. Philadelphus (283–247 B.C.) was induced by his librarian Demetrius Phalereus to have the laws of the Jews also translated into Greek for his library. At his request the Jewish high priest Eleasar sent him seventy-two able men, six out of each tribe, by whose labours the whole was finished in seventy-two days (for particulars, see No. VII.). The historical nature of this account, embellished as it is by a multitude of graphic details, is now generally given up. The only question is whether the foundation of the fictitious embellishment may not perhaps be some historical tradition, the essence of which was, that the translation of the Jewish law into Greek was projected by Ptolemy Philadelphus at the instance of Demetrius Phalereus.⁵ This would in itself be very possible. For the learned and literary zeal of the Ptolemies and especially of Ptolemy Philadelphus would certainly make it conceivable, that he should wish to incorporate the law of the Jews also in his library. In favour of this view may also be cited the circumstance, that the Jewish philosopher Aristobulus, in the time of Ptolemy VI. Philometor, relates just what we have designated as the possible essence of the tradition, without betraying any acquaintance with the fictitious embellishments of the Epistle of Aristeas, which seems to show that he was following some tradition quite independent of the said Epistle.⁶ It is how-

⁵ So e.g. Wellhausen in his revision of Bleek's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (4th ed. 1878), p. 571 sqq.

⁶ The passage from Aristobulus is given in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 12, 1–2 (ed. Gaisford). Aristobulus is here speaking of the fact, that Plato was already acquainted with the Jewish legislation. To show the possibility of this he asserts, that its virtual contents had been translated into Greek before Demetrius Phalereus. Then he continues: 'Η δ' ὅλη ἐμμενεία

ever suspicious, that according to a very trustworthy account, Demetrius Phalereus did not live at the court of Ptolemy at all, but had already been banished by him from Alexandria immediately after the death of Ptolemy Lagos.⁷ Thus the supposed essence of the tradition also falls, and there remains merely a bare possibility that the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch owes its origin to the literary efforts of Ptolemy Philadelphus. It is also as possible, that it was called forth by the exigencies of the Jews themselves. For Jews, who had at heart the maintenance of an acquaintance with the law even among the Dispersion, observing that the knowledge of the sacred language was more and more decreasing, and that the Jews of the Dispersion were appropriating Greek as their mother tongue, might feel themselves induced to translate the law into Greek for the purpose of preserving the knowledge of it among Greek Jews also. This translation, having been in the first place undertaken as a private labour, gradually obtained official validity also. But obscure as is the origin of the translation, it may be safely admitted, on internal grounds, that its *locality was Alexandria* and its date the third century before Christ, for the Hellenist Demetrius, who wrote in the time of Ptolemy IV. (222–205), certainly made use of it (see below, No. III.).

The preceding remarks apply only to the translation of the Pentateuch, to which alone the Aristeas legend refers. But after the sacred Thorah had once been made accessible to Hellenistic Jews, the need of possessing the rest of the Scriptures in the Greek tongue was gradually experienced. Hence translations first of the *prophets* and afterwards of the *Hagiographa* followed. These too chiefly originated in Egypt.

τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου πάντων ἐπὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Φιλαδέλφου βασιλέως, σοῦ δὲ προγόνου, προσενεγκαμένου μείζονα φιλοτιμίαν, Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως πραγματευσαμένου τὰ περὶ τούτων.

⁷ The authority for this is Hermippus Callimachus, who lived under Ptolemy III. and IV. See the passage from Diogenes Laert. v. 78, in Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iii. 47, and in the same work, p. 48, the discussions on the credibility of the information.

Some of the Hagiographa, such as the Book of Daniel and some of the psalms, not having been composed till the era of the Maccabees, the Greek translations of these more recent Hagiographa cannot have been made earlier than about the middle of the second century before Christ. It seems however that in fact the translations into Greek of the bulk of the Hagiographa together with the prophets were at about this time already in existence. Sirach the grandson of Jesus, who came to Egypt in the year 132, excuses the defects of his translation by the fact, that what is said in Hebrew does not retain the same meaning when translated into another language, which is, he says, the case not only in his work, but also in the Law and the Prophets and the other Scriptures (Wisdom, Prolog.: οὐ γὰρ ἰσοδυναμεῖ αὐτὰ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑβραϊστὶ λεγόμενα καὶ ὅταν μεταχθῇ εἰς ἑτέραν γλῶσσαν· οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων οὐ μικρὰν ἔχει τὴν διαφορὰν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λεγόμενα). Hence he evidently was already acquainted with a translation of the Prophets and the "other Scriptures." The Septuagint translation of Chronicles was certainly known to Eupolemus, who wrote about the middle of the second century before Christ (see below, paragraph 3, and Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, p. 119); that of the Book of Job to the historian Aristeeas, whose date it must be admitted is not exactly known, but who, being quoted by Alexander Polyhistor, must have lived at latest in the first half of the first century before Christ (see below, No. III., and Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, p. 139).⁸

After what has been said no further proof of all these translations being of Jewish origin is needed. The character of the translation differs widely in the different books, being now tolerably free, now helplessly verbal, but chiefly the latter. As yet a precise investigation has been made only

⁸ Grätz insists, on utterly insufficient grounds, on transposing the translation of Job to the first century after Christ (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums*, 1877, pp. 83–91).

of individual books. A special difficulty in such investigation lies in the fact, that it is often necessary to reconstruct the Hebrew text, which must have been in the hands of the translators. In one point however all these works are alike, viz. in the barbarous Greek produced under the influence of the Hebrew originals. *Quite a new language, swarming with such strong Hebraisms that a Greek could not understand it*, is here created. Not to mention the imitation of Hebrew constructions, many Greek words, which correspond to *one* meaning of a Hebrew word, are without further ceremony made equivalent to the *whole extent* of the meanings comprised in the Hebrew word, and thus significations are forced upon words, which they do not at all possess in Greek (*e.g.* the words *δόξα*, *εἰρήνη* and many others). How far colloquial intercourse with Hellenized Jews may have anticipated the labours of the translators cannot be determined. It is probable that an alternative action here took place. Much which the translators ventured upon was already found by them in colloquial language. But then the reaction upon the development of Judaic Greek exercised by a translation, which came into general use, would at the least be quite as great.

For the translations in question were not only combined into a whole, but were also *universally accepted by the Jews of the Dispersion as their text of Scripture*. The oldest Hellenists, Demetrius and Eupolemus, in their compilations of Scripture history rely solely upon the Septuagint; Philo throughout assumes it, Josephus does so for the most part. With Philo the text of the Septuagint is so far a sacred text, that he argues from its casual details, nay, not only did this translation universally penetrate into private use, but it was also used as Holy Scripture in the synagogue service (see vol. ii. Div. ii. p. 285). It was then transferred from the hands of the Jews to the Christian Church and regarded by it as the authentic text of Scripture. But the very circumstance of the Christian Church taking possession of this translation and deriving thence its polemical weapons in its conflict with the Jews

gradually co-operated in bringing the Septuagint into discredit with them and in giving rise to new Jewish translations, especially that of Aquila, which in the time of Origen stood in higher respect with the Jews than did the Septuagint.

The text of the Septuagint has come down to us solely by the tradition of the Christian Church. In its history the learned labours of Origen, which finally—and not without his own fault—led to a base corruption of the text, are epoch-making. Origen, on account of the uncertainty of the Septuagint text, and its great deviations from the Hebrew, prepared a large edition of the Bible, in which were written, in six adjacent columns: (1) The Hebrew text in Hebrew characters; (2) the Hebrew text in Greek characters; (3) the translation of Aquila; (4) that of Symmachus; (5) the Septuagint; (6) the translation of Theodotion, and indeed in this order (see Hieronymus, *Comment. in Tit.* iii. 9 [*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, vii. 1. 734]; Epiphan. *de mensuris et ponderibus*, § 19, and the other evidences in Field, *Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt prolegom.* p. 50). This was to lay a sure foundation for learned Scripture exegesis, and especially for learned controversy against the Jews, who often reproached Christians with their ignorance of the genuine text of Scripture (see on the motive and object of his undertaking, Origen, *Comment. in Matth.* vol. xv. c. xiv.; *epist. ad African.* § 5). The work, affording a sixfold Scripture text, was called *the Hexapla*. Origen also prepared another edition without the two Hebrew columns, which was called *the Tetrapla* (Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 16). On the other hand it was also called *Octapla*, because in certain books of the Old Testament two anonymous Greek translations were added to the above-named six texts (Epiphan. *de mensuris et ponderibus*, § 19; Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 16. Comp. on the whole work the Prolegomena in Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, 2 vols. Oxonii 1875, and the Introductions to the Old Test. of e.g. De Wette-Schrader, § 56; Bleek-Wellhausen, § 282). The fatal circumstance was, that Origen was not content with placing the text of the Septuagint in juxtaposition with the others, but, to facilitate its use, *noted in the Septuagint text itself the deviations from the Hebrew* by (a) furnishing such words, sentences, or paragraphs as were missing in the Hebrew with an obelus (the sign of erasure), and (b) *by interpolating, with the addition of an asterisk, from other translations, and mostly from Theodotion, those found in the Hebrew and missing in the Septuagint* (see his own remarks in his *Comment. in Matth.* vol. xv. c. xiv. [Lommatzsch, iii. 357]: καὶ τινὰ μὲν ὠβελίσσαμεν ἐν τῷ ἑβραϊκῷ μὴ κείμενα, οὐ τολμήσαντες αὐτὰ

πάντη περιελθὼν τινὰ δὲ μετ' ἀστερίσκων προσεθήκαμεν. Hieronymus, *Praef. in vers. Paralipom.* [ed. Vallarsi, ix. 1407 sq.]: sed, quod majoris, audaciae est, in editione Septuaginta Theodotionis editionem miscuit, asteriscis designans quae minus ante fuerant, et virgulis, quae ex superfluo videbantur apposita). He often proceeded also in a similar manner with inaccurate translations of the LXX. "by adding with an asterisk, behind the obelized reading of the LXX., the parallel passages corresponding with the Hebrew from another version" (Bleek-Wellhausen, p. 586). This text then, especially copied from the Hexapla, and often showing very careless dealing with the critical marks, being disseminated since Eusebius (see Field, *Proleg.* p. 99), a mass of such "hexaplarian" readings was introduced into the traditional text of the Septuagint; the common text (κοινή ἔκδοσις) being corrected by this hexaplarian one. The exclusion of hexaplarian additions is therefore the chief task of Septuagint criticism; and this is still approximately attainable for most of the books of the Old Testament, the critical notes of Origen being still extant, partly in certain Greek manuscripts, partly in the Syriac translation of the hexaplarian Septuagint text (see Bleek-Wellhausen, *Eintl. in das A. T.* pp. 593, 588 sqq.). The inserted matter has been very completely collected in Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*, 2 vols. Oxonii 1875. By the separation however from the hexaplarian text of the Septuagint of the passages marked with an asterisk, the original text is by no means obtained. The MSS. already varied very much in the time of Origen (see *Comment. in Matth.* vol. xv. c. xiv., ed. Lommatzsch, iii. 357). Origen first compiled from them a text for himself, and then quietly altered, according to the Hebrew, many particulars in it, which could not be made known by obelus or asterisk (Field, p. 60 sqq.). Hence such a proceeding will only obtain the *Recension of Origen*.

Others besides Origen have occupied themselves with learned labours upon the text of the Septuagint. We know especially of two other recensions, those of Hesychius and Lucianus; the former of these was disseminated in Egypt, the latter from Antioch to Constantinople (Hieronymus, *praef. in vers. Paralipom.*, ed. Vallarsi, ix. 1405 sq.: Alexandria et Egypta in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem. Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani Martyris exemplaria probat. Mediae inter has provinciae Palestinos codices legunt, quos ab Origine elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt; totusque orbis hac inter se trifaria varietate compugnat). Hesychius is perhaps identical with the Egyptian bishop of this name, who

suffered martyrdom in the persecution of Maximinus, 312 (Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* viii. 13. 7). No particulars are known concerning the nature of his recension. Lucianus was the noted presbyter of Antioch, who also suffered martyrdom in the persecution of Maximinus, 312 (Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* viii. 13. 2, ix. 6. 3). His recension was an emendation of the Septuagint according to the Hebrew with the help of other Greek translations (Suidas, *Lex. s.v.*: Λουκιανὸς ὁ μάρτυς αὐτὸς ἀπάσας [*scil.* τὰς ἱερὰς βίβλους] ἀναλαβὼν ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραϊδὸς αὐτὰς ἐπανενέωσατο γλώττης, ἣν καὶ αὐτὴν ἡκριβωκῶς ἐς τὰ μάλιστα ἦν). Comp. Field, *Proleg.* cap. ix. Harnack in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. viii. 767 sqq. on "Hesychius and Lucianus." Also the Introductions to the Old Testament, e.g. De Wette-Schrader, § 57; Bleek-Wellhausen, § 283. According to the recent investigations of Field and Lagarde (see *Theol. Litztg.* 1876, p. 605), the recension of Lucianus is still preserved in several MSS. Lagarde has edited the text according to these (one volume has as yet appeared, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum pars 1 graece edita*, Götting. 1883).

The labours however of Hesychius and Lucianus have but contributed to further confusion in the text of the Septuagint. For the text of the *κοινή* is now not only mixed up with the Hexapla text, but also with those of Hesychius and Lucianus, and the former having been, even in the text of Origen, very uncertain, there is no longer any prospect of a certain recovery of the original text of the Septuagint. It is true that being still acquainted with the chief recensions, we are in a position safely to pronounce judgment as to which of the MSS. is comparatively freest from the peculiarities of these recensions, and therefore represents with the greatest comparative purity the original text. The old Latin texts also furnish important assistance.

Among those Greek manuscripts, which contain the whole Old Testament or at least a great part of it, the *Vaticanus* (1209) is acknowledged to hold the first rank with respect to the purity of the text. Its text has been ostensibly published by Mai (*Vetus et Novum Testamentum ex antiquissimo codice Vaticano*, 5 vols. Rome 1857). His edition is however very untrustworthy. More accurate is the new Roman *édition de luxe* in facsimile type (*Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecus codex Vaticanus*, edd. Vercellone and Cozza, 6 vols. Rom 1868-1881, price of each vol. £6; comp. also *Theol. Litztg.* 1882, p. 121). Next to the *Vaticanus* must be mentioned the *Sinaiticus*, discovered by Tischendorf in the year 1859, of which about half of the Old Testament has been preserved. *Edition de luxe*, *Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus*, ed. Tischendorf, 4 vols. Petersburg 1862. Tischendorf had previously discovered a smaller portion of this manuscript, and published it under the title of *Frederico-Augustanus* (*Codex Frederico-Augustanus*, ed. Tischen-

dorf, Lips. 1846).—The Alexandrinus, which is already much infected by hexaplarian readings, ranks third among these great Bible manuscripts. It forms the foundation of Grabe's edition of the Septuagint. The *Vetus Testamentum Graecum e Codice MS. Alexandrino*, cura Henrici Herveii Baber, 3 vols. London 1812–1826, gives the text of the MS. itself. Recently an edition has been prepared in photo-lithographic facsimile, of which the portion comprising the New Testament has been first issued (*Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus, New Testament and Clementine Epistles, published by order of the Trustees*, London 1879; comp. *Theol. Litztg.* 1880, p. 230).—The Old Testament appeared in 3 vols. 1881 sqq. Comp. also on the manuscripts the Prolegomena of the editions, especially Holmes - Parsons and Tischendorf. The publications of Tischendorf (*Monumenta sacra inedita*) and Ceriani (*Monumenta sacra et profana*) contain much material.

Bibliographical information concerning the numerous editions of the Septuagint will be found in Le Long, *Bibliotheca sacra*, ed. Masch. vol. ii. 2, 1781, pp. 262–304. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca graeca*, ed. Harles, iii. 673 sqq. Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur der bibl. Kritik und Exegese*, vol. ii. 1798, pp. 279–322. Winer, *Handbuch der Theol. Literatur*, i. 47 sq. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, 1841, pp. 242–252. Tischendorf, Prolegomena to his edition. De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung in das A. T.* § 58. All the editions fall back upon the following four chief editions: (1) The Complutensian Polyglot, 6 vols. in *Complutensi universitate*, 1514–1517. (2) The Aldina, *Sacrae Scripturae Veteris Novaeque omnia*, Venice 1518. (3) The Roman or Sixtine edition, *Vetus Testamentum juxta Septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti V. Pont. Max. editum*, Rome 1587. The text of this edition is relatively the best among the printed texts, conforming as it does frequently, though by no means entirely, to the Vaticanus, 1209. Since the majority of the more recent editions reproduce this Sixtine text, the printed common text is a relatively good one. (4) Grabe's edition, *Septuaginta Interpretum*, vols. i.–iv. ed. Grabe, Oxonii 1707–1720. It chiefly follows the Codex Alexandrinus. Of recent editions the most important is *Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, edd. Holmes and Parsons, 5 vols. Oxonii 1798–1827. The text is reproduced from the Sixtine edition, but accompanied by an unusually copious collection of manuscript various readings. Though what is offered is not quite trustworthy, and rather confuses than instructs by its copiousness, still this edition has the merit of having for the first time brought forward the material furnished by the MSS. in general (comp. Bleek and Wellhausen, *Einl. in das A. T.* p. 592 sq.). The manual edition of Tischendorf, *Vetus Testamentum Graece juxta LXX. interpretes*, 2 vols. Lips. 1850,

2nd ed. 1880, also gives the Sixtine text with only unimportant corrections. Nestle has added to the sixth edition a collation of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, as well as of the Alexandrinus already collated by Tischendorf (*Veteris Testamenti Graeci codices Vaticanus et Sinaiticus cum textu recepto collati ab E. Nestle*, Lips. 1880).

The literature on the Septuagint is almost unbounded (comp. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. gr.* iii. 658 sqq. Rosenmüller, *Handb. für die Literatur der bibl. Kritik und Exegese*, ii. 395 sqq. De Wette-Schrader, *Einl. in das A. T.* § 51 sqq. Fritzsche in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2 vols. i. 280 sqq.). The chief work of earlier date is: Hody, *De bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Graecis et Latina vulgata*, Oxon. 1705. Of recent times may be mentioned: (1) On single books, Thiersch, *De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina*, Erlang. 1841. Hollenberg, *Der Charakter der alexandrinischen Uebersetzung des Buches Josua und ihr textkritischer Werth*, Moers 1876 (Gymnasial-progr.). Wichelhaus, *De Jeremiae versione Alexandrina*, Halis 1847. Vollers, *Das Dodekapropheten der Alexandriner*, 1st half, Berlin 1880. The same in Stade's *Zeitschr. für die alttestamentl. Wissensch.* vol. iii. 1883, pp. 219-272, vol. iv. 1884, pp. 1-20. Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien*, Leipzig 1863. Bickell, *De indole ac ratione versionis Alex. in interpretando libro Jobi*, Marb. 1863. (2) On the whole: Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, Leipzig 1841. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 465 sqq., 534-556. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 322 sqq. Gfrörer, *Philo*, ii. 8-18. Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religions-Philosophie*, ii. 1-72. Fritzsche, art. "Alexandrinische Uebersetzung des A. T.," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. i. 280-290. The Introductions to the Old Testament of Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hävernick, Keil and others, especially De Wette, *Lehrbuch der hist.-krit. Einl. in die kanon und apokr. Bücher des A. T.* viii., edited by Schrader (1869), § 51-58. Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 4th ed., superintended by Wellhausen (1878), pp. 571-598. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), § 436-439.

2. *Aquila and Theodotion.*

The Septuagint translation was indisputably regarded as the sacred text of the Scriptures by Hellenistic Jews down to the beginning of the second century after Christ. The period of its ascendancy is at the same time that of the prime of Hellenistic Judaism. Subsequently to the second century the

latter entered upon a slow but continuous course of retrogression, which—to leave out of consideration the limits prescribed to the encroachments of Judaism by political legislation—was mainly brought about by the co-operation of two factors, viz. the increased power of Rabbinic Judaism and the victorious advance of Christianity. A significant symptom in this movement was *the new Greek translations of the Bible, the object of which was to place in the hand of Greek-speaking Jews a text in conformity with the authorized Hebrew one.* It is true, that on the one hand the undertaking of such translations was a proof of the still existing strength and importance of Hellenistic Judaism. On the other hand however they show, that Hebrew authority had now attained acceptance and acknowledgment in a far stricter sense than formerly in the region of Hellenistic Judaism. The Jews of the Dispersion were renouncing their own culture and placing themselves under the guardianship of the Rabbins. These translations are at the same time a monument in the history of the struggle between Judaism and Christianity. They were to place in the hands of the Jews a polemical weapon in their contest with Christian theologians, who were making the most of the very uncertain Septuagint text in their own cause (comp. especially Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph. c. 68, s. fin., 71* and elsewhere).

Of the three Greek translations of the Bible, which Origen placed in his Hexapla of the Septuagint (Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, see above, p. 164) only Aquila and Theodotion will here engage our notice; for Symmachus was, according to Euseb. *Hist. eccl. vi. 17*, an Ebionite and therefore a Christian. Of Theodotion too it is not certain whether he was a Jew. Aquila on the contrary is unanimously designated as such, and indeed as a proselyte.

According to Irenaeus, who is the first to mention Aquila, he was a Jewish proselyte of Pontus. The statement with respect to his native land is, by reason of its striking parallel with Acts xviii. 2, somewhat suspicious, though Epiphanius more precisely names Sinope in Pontus as his home. On the

other hand it seems certain—notwithstanding his thorough knowledge of Hebrew—that Aquila was a proselyte. For he is designated as such (עֲקִילָס הַיֵּזְרִי) not only by all the Fathers, but also in the Jerusalem Talmud and in Rabbinic literature in general. Of the fables related of him by Epiphanius—that he was a relation (πενθερίδης) of the Emperor Hadrian, that he at first turned Christian, then was excluded from the Christian Church on account of his inclination to astrology and became a Jew—thus much is credible, that he lived in the time of Hadrian. Rabbinical tradition also places him in the time of R. Elieser, R. Joshua and R. Akiba, and thus in the first decades of the second century after Christ. The aim of his translation was to imitate the Hebrew text as exactly as possible, so that he not only ventured upon the bold formation of a multitude of new words, for the purpose of obtaining Greek terms, which should exactly correspond with Hebrew ones, but he slavishly rendered Hebrew particles by Greek particles, even when their meaning did not allow it (for proof of this see Field and others). A noted example ridiculed by Jerome is, that in the very first sentence of Genesis he rendered the sign of the accusative אֵל by σύν (σύν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τῇ γῇ). This attention to the most trifling detail may perhaps be referred to the influence of Akiba, whose pupil Aquila is said to have been. Jerome often mentions a *prima* and *secunda editio* of Aquila. And the numerous passages in which two different translations are referred to Aquila (collected in Field), confirm the existence of two different editions of the work. On account of its close accordance with the Hebrew text the work was at its first appearance favoured by R. Elieser and R. Joshua the eminent Rabbinical authorities, and was, as testified by Origen and also indirectly confirmed by Justinian's 146th *Novella*, soon much preferred to the LXX. by Hellenistic Jews. About a dozen passages are quoted from it in Rabbinic literature. The work as a whole perished with Rabbinic Judaism. For what remains of it we are indebted to its admission into Origen's Hexapla.

Numerous notices of Aquila's translation are preserved from the latter work, some by quotations in Eusebius, Jerome and other Fathers, who still made use of the original Hexapla in the library of Pamphilus at Caesarea (Hieron. *comment. in Tit.* iii. 9, ed. Vallarsi, vii. 1. 734), some in marginal notes in the MSS. of the Hexaplarian Septuagint text.

Irenaeus, iii. 21. 1 (in Greek in Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 8. 10): ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἔνιοί φασι τῶν νῦν τολμῶντων μεθερμηνεύειν τὴν γραφὴν "ἰδοὺ ἡ νεᾷνις ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν," ὡς Θεοδοσίων ἡρμηνεύσειν ὁ Ἐφέσιος καὶ Ἀκύλας ὁ Ποντικὸς, ἀμφοτέροι' Ἰουδαῖοι προσήλυτοι. Eusebius, *Demonstr. evang.* vii. 1. 32, ed. Gaisford (p. 316, ed. Paris): προσήλυτος δὲ ὁ Ἀκύλας ἦν, οὐ φύσει Ἰουδαῖος. Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus*, § 14, 15.

Hieronymus, *Epist.* 57 *ad Pammachium*, c. 11 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, i. 316): Aquila autem proselytus et contentiosus interpres, qui non solum verba sed etymologias quoque verborum transferre conatus est, jure projicitur a nobis. Quis enim pro frumento et vino et oleo possit vel legere vel intelligere χεῦμα, δπωρισμόν, σιλπνότητα, quod nos possumus dicere fusionem pomationem et splendentiam. Aut quia Hebraei non solum habent ἄρθρα sed et πρόαρθρα, ille κατοζήλως et syllabas interpretatur et literas dicitque σύν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σύν τὴν γῆν, quod Graeca et Latina lingua omnino non recipit. Jerome generally gives a very favourable opinion of the accuracy and trustworthiness of Aquila. See *Epist.* 32 *ad Marcellam* (Vallarsi, i. 152), *Comm. in Jesaj.* xlix. 5, 6 (Vallarsi, iv. 564), *Comm. in Hoseam* ii. 16, 17 (Vallarsi, vi. 656). See the passages of Jerome in which he mentions the *prima* and *secunda editio* of Aquila, in Field, *Origenis Hexaplae quae supersunt, proleg.* p. xxv. sq.

Talmud jer. *Megilla* i. 11, fol. 71^e: חירנא עקילא הנר התורה לפני ר' אליעזר ולפני ר' יהושע וקילסו אותו ואמרו לו יפֿיֿתֿ מבני אדם, "Aquila the proselyte translated the Thorah in the time of R. Elieser and R. Joshua; and they praised him and said to him, 'Thou art the fairest among the children of men'" (Ps. xlv. 3, with an allusion to the translation of the Thorah into the Japhetic). Jer. *Kiddushin* i. 1, fol. 59^a: חירנא עקילא הנר לפני ר' עקיבא, "Aquila the proselyte translated in the time of Akiba," etc. Hieronymus, *Comment. in Jes.* viii. 11 sqq. (Vallarsi, iv. 122 sq.): Akibas quem magistrum Aquilae proselyti autumant. (Comp. vol. i. Div. ii. p. 376.) A collection of Rabbinical passages, in which the translation of Aquila is quoted, is already given by Asariah de Rossi, *Meor Enajim*, c. 45; comp. also Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebraea*, i. 958–960, iii. 890–894; Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 82 sq.; and most exhaust-

ively by Anger, *De Akila*, pp. 12–25. The name of Aquila is in Rabbinical literature often distorted into *Ὀνκῆλος* (Onkelos); so also e.g. in all the passages of the Tosefta, see Zuckermannel's edition, Index, s.v. *Ὀνκῆλος*.

Origenes, *epist. ad African.* c. 2: 'Ακύλας . . . φιλοτιμότερον πεπιστευμένος παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις ἡρμηνευκέναι τὴν γραφὴν ᾧ μάλιστα εἰώθασι οἱ ἀγνοοῦντες τὴν Ἑβραίων διάλεκτον χρῆσθαι, ὥς πάντων μᾶλλον ἐπιτετευγμένῳ. It is mentioned in Justinian's *Novella* 146, that it was disputed among the Jews themselves, whether the Scriptures were to be read in Hebrew or Greek in the synagogue service. Justinian directs that the latter shall not be hindered, and, as a Christian emperor, recommends in the first place the use of the Septuagint, but permits also the use of Aquila's translation (which was thus manifestly preferred by the Jews).

The fragments are very completely collected in Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, 2 vols. Oxonii 1875. The chief work formerly was Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt*, 2 vols. Paris 1713. Freudenthal regards the Septuagint translation of Ecclesiastes as the work of Aquila, see *Alexander Polyhistor*, p. 65, note.

The Literature: Hody, *De biblicorum textibus* (1705), pp. 573–578. Montfaucon, *Hexapl. Orig., praelim.* pp. 46–51. Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, iii. 690–692. Anger, *De Onkelo, Chaldaico quem ferunt Pentateuchi paraphraste et quid ei rationis intercedat cum Akila, Graeco Veteris Testamenti interprete*, Part I.: *De Akila*, Lips. 1845. Field, *Proleg.* pp. xvi.–xxvii. Arnold, art. "Bibelübersetzungen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. ii. 187 sq. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vii. 386–390. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 62–64. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 2nd ed. p. 437 sqq. Lagarde, *Clementina* (1865), p. 12 sqq. Joel, *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte* (1880), p. 43 sqq. *Die Einleitungen in's Alte Testament von Eichhorn* (4th ed.), i. 521–531; Bertholdt, ii. 534–537; Herbst, i. 155–157; Keil (3rd ed.), p. 557 sq.; De Wette-Schrader, § 55; Bleek-Wellhausen, § 281.

It might appear questionable whether Theodotion, who as well as Symmachus is as a rule called an Ebionite by Jerome, should be named here at all. But Jerome elsewhere calls him a Jew, and in a passage, in which he expresses himself most precisely, states the former as only the opinion of some. The other opinion, viz. that Theodotion was a Jew, and indeed a Jewish proselyte, is evidenced by Irenaeus and also by Epiphanius, whose fictions (that Theodotion was at first a

Marcionite and then went over to Judaism) are not deserving of credit. According to Irenaeus, Theodotion was a native of Ephesus. Epiphanius makes him a Marcionite and a native of Pontus. With regard to his date Epiphanius, who places him under Commodus (A.D. 180–192), is generally credited. But the statements of Epiphanius are here untrustworthy. Nor must the circumstance, that Origen places Theodotion in the last place in his Hexapla, mislead us to the notion of his being the most recent of these translators of Scripture.⁹ He is at all events a predecessor of Irenaeus and very probably not more recent than Aquila, for *the use of his translation in the Shepherd of Hermas* has lately been raised to almost a certainty. The work of Theodotion pursues in general the same object as that of Aquila, viz. that of furnishing a translation, which should render the Hebrew text more accurately than is done by the LXX. Theodotion however bases his work upon the LXX, correcting the latter according to the Hebrew, so that it can only be called a thorough revision of this translation with which it is however in very close accordance. One peculiarity of his work is, that he transcribes Hebrew words into Greek without translating them even more frequently than Aquila and Symmachus (Field gives a list of all the known cases, *Proleg.* p. 40 sq.). We have no evidence of the use of this translation among the Jews. *His translation of Daniel*, having been received by the Christian Church and having therefore supplanted the original Septuagint translation of Daniel in the Septuagint manuscripts, *has come down to us complete* (the latter is preserved in only one MS., a *codex Chisianus*).¹⁰ For the rest numerous fragments of Theodotion have been preserved in the same manner as those of Aquila.

⁹ The order in the Hexapla is arranged simply from the view-point of matter. Origen gives first the Hebrew text, then Aquila and Symmachus as most closely conforming to the Hebrew text, then the LXX. and after this Theodotion, because his work was properly but a revision of the LXX.

¹⁰ In Theodotion's version of Daniel, *the apocryphal additions are also retained*. From this Jerome translated them (see *Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ix 1876, 1899).

Hieronymus, *De viris illustr.* c. liv. (Vallarsi, ii. 893): Aquilae scilicet Pontici proselyti et *Theodotionis Hebionei* et Symmachi ejusdem dogmatis. Idem, *Comment. in Habak.* iii. 11–13 (Vallarsi, vi. 656): Theodotio autem vere quasi pauper et *Ebionita* sed et Symmachus ejusdem dogmatis pauperem sensum secuti Judaice transtulerunt. . . . Isti *Semichristiani* Judaice transtulerunt, et Judaeus Aquila interpretatus est ut Christianus. Idem, *praef. in vers. Iob* (Vallarsi, ix. 1100): Judaeus Aquila, Symmachus et Theodotio *judaizantes haeretici*. Elsewhere however Jerome calls Theodotion simply a Jew, see *Epist.* 112 *ad Augustin.* c. 19 (Vallarsi, i. 752): *hominis Judaei atque blasphemii*. Jerome expresses himself most precisely in the *praef. comment. in Daniel* (Vallarsi, v. 619 sq.): Illud quoque lectorem admoneo, Daniele non juxta LXX. interpretes sed juxta Theodotionem ecclesias legere, qui utique post adventum Christi *incredulus fuit, licet eum quidam dicant Ebionitam*, qui altero genere Judaeus est.

Irenaeus, iii. 21. 1 (= Euseb. *H. E.* v. 8. 10); see the passage above, p. 171. Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus*, § 17, 18.

As for the chronology, the circumstance which is chiefly decisive is, that Theodotion was certainly the predecessor of Irenaeus. For the latter not only expressly mentions him, but also makes use of his translation of Daniel (see Zahn, art. "Irenaeus," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vii. 131). The relation of Justin Martyr to Theodotion is doubtful. The text of the long portion, which he quotes from Daniel, *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. xxxi., agrees indeed in many minutiae with Theodotion in opposition to the Septuagint of the *cod. Chisianus*, and yet the use of the former cannot be inferred, because the agreement with the latter preponderates. See Credner, *Beiträge zur Einl. in die biblischen Schriften*, vol. ii. (1838) pp. 253–274. In the Shepherd of Hermas, *Vis.* iv. 2. 4, however use is freely made of Daniel vi. 23, and that in a form which strikingly agrees with Theodotion in opposition to the LXX. (see Hort in John Hopkins' *University Circular*, December 1884, and Harnack, *Theol. Litztg.* 1885, p. 146). Hence it can scarcely be doubted that he preceded Hermas. *But perhaps he was also a predecessor of Aquila*, for after the acceptance of Aquila's translation by the Hellenistic Jews, forming as it does the first halting-place on the way to the formation of a Greek translation of the Bible in strict conformity with the Hebrew, his would have been tolerably superfluous. This assumption will also explain his disappearance from Jewish tradition. It is also worthy of remark, *that Irenaeus names him before Aquila*. Finally, it may also be mentioned, that in the *Revelation of St. John* sentences and expressions from Daniel are used in a form

which accords more with Theodotion than the Septuagint (ix. 20, x. 5, xiii. 7, xx. 4. Comp. Salmon, *Introduction to the Study of the Books of the Old Testament*, 1885, pp. 654-668; and in accordance with it Harnack, *Theol. Litztg.* 1885, p. 267). It must however be confessed, that the accordances are not of a kind to allow us to infer with certainty an acquaintance with Theodotion's work on the part of the writer of the Apocalypse.

On the relation of Theodotion to the Septuagint, Jerome says in his *Comment. in Ecclesiastes*, ii. (Vallarsi, iii. 396): *Septuaginta vero et Theodotio sicut in pluribus locis ita et in hoc quoque concordant (i.e. in opposition to Aquila and Symmachus).*

The acceptance of Theodotion's version of Daniel by the Christian Church in place of the Septuagint is repeatedly testified by Jerome, see *Contra Rufin.* ii. 33 (Vallarsi, ii. 527); *praef. comment. in Daniel* (Vallarsi, v. 619 sq.); *praef. in version. Daniel* (Vallarsi, ix. 1361 sq.).

The Literature: Hody, *De biblicorum textibus* (1705), pp. 579-585. Montfaucon, *Hexapl. Orig. praelim.* pp. 56, 57. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca graec.*, ed. Harles, iii. 692-695. Field, *Orig. Hexapl. proleg.* pp. xxxviii.-xlii.. Arnold, art. "Bibelübersetzungen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. ii. 188. Fürst in the *Literaturbl. des Orients*, 1848, p. 793. Credner, as above. Zahn, as above. *Supernatural Religion* (complete edition, 1879), ii. 210 sq. The Introductions to the Old Testament of Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Herbst, Keil, De Wette-Schrader, Bleek-Wellhausen and others. The older literature in Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 420-422.

II. REVISION AND COMPLETION OF SCRIPTURE LITERATURE.

The work of Aquila and its favourable reception on the part of the Hellenistic Jews prove, that from about the second century after Christ, Hellenistic Judaism also kept strictly to the text and canon of the Palestinians. This is confirmed by the expressions of Origen in his Epistle to Julius Africanus. He here speaks of such component parts of the canon as are missing in the Hebrew, especially of the additions to Daniel and Esther, and the Books of Tobit and Judith, as if they had never belonged to the Jewish canon. He regards them as the exclusive possession of Christians and

says plainly that they are rejected by the Jews, without making any distinction between Greek and Hebrew Jews (*Epist. ad African.* c. 2, 3, and 13). Hence the canon of the Palestinians was at that time absolutely valid among the Jews of the Dispersion also. This was not the case in earlier times. The Jews of the Dispersion indeed always possessed on the whole the same Scriptures as those of Palestine. But *in Palestine the canon attained a settled form about the second century before Christ.* Later works, even when they appeared under the name of sacred authorities and found approbation, were no longer incorporated therein. *Among the Hellenistic Jews, on the contrary, the boundaries still fluctuated for some centuries.* A whole multitude of works, originating in the last two centuries before or even in the first after Christ, were united by them to the collection of the Holy Scriptures, and among them some also which, being originally written in Hebrew and originating in Palestine, did not become the property of Hellenistic Judaism till they had been translated into Greek. We have certainly no direct evidence of this fact. But the fact that the Christian canon of the Old Testament was from the beginning of wider and more vacillating extent than the Hebrew, can only be explained by the circumstance, that the Christian Church received the canon in just this form from the hands of Hellenistic Judaism. Hence the latter, at the time of the founding of the Christian Church, had in its collection of Holy Scriptures those books, which are in the Protestant Church designated, according to the precedent of Jerome, as "apocryphal," because they are absent from the Hebrew canon. One thing however must not be forgotten, that on the whole no settled boundary existed.

It is in accordance with this long maintained freedom in dealing with the canon, that the *Hellenistic Jews allowed themselves a liberty of procedure with single works longer than the Palestinians did.* In the same manner as Palestinian Judaism had *formerly* acted with respect to its literature, did Hellenistic Judaism during our period also, freely handle and

enrich by additions works already canonical in Palestine. This treatment had as a rule the same motives and objects as the legendary embellishment of more ancient sacred history. The only difference was, that in the case of books already canonical, the legend was placed beside the Scripture text, while in that of books not as yet received into the canon, it was interpolated in the text itself.

The majority of those books which, though admitted by the Hellenistic Jews into the collection of the Holy Scriptures, originally made no claim to be esteemed as such, has therefore been treated of by us elsewhere. We here group together only (1) the revisions and completions of such books as had in their more ancient forms become canonical in Palestine (Ezra, Esther, Daniel, the Prayer of Manasseh [an addition to 2 Chron. xxxiii.]), and (2) certain books, which from the first aspired to be regarded as Scripture, and which entered as such into the Hellenistic collection of the Scriptures (Baruch, the Epistle of Jeremiah).

1. *The Greek Ezra.*

Besides the Greek translation of the Hebrew canonical Book of Ezra, there is also a free Greek revision, differing from the canonical Ezra partly by transpositions, partly by interpolations. The exact relation between the two will appear from the following survey of the composition of the Greek Ezra :—

Chap. i. = 2 Chron. xxxv.—xxxvi. : Restoration of the temple worship under Josiah (639–609), and history of the successors of Josiah down to the destruction of the temple (588).

Chap. ii. 1–14 = Ezra i. : Cyrus in the first year of his reign (537) permits the return of the exiles and delivers up the sacred vessels.

- Chap. ii. 15-25 = Ezra iv. 7-24: In consequence of a complaint against the Jews, Artaxerxes forbids (465-425) the continuance of the rebuilding of (the temple and) the walls of Jerusalem.
- Chap. iii.-v. 6: independent: Zerubbabel obtains the favour of Darius (521-485) and receives from him permission for the return of the exiles.
- Chap. v. 7-70 = Ezra ii. 1-iv. 5: A list of those who returned with Zerubbabel, the operations of Zerubbabel and the interruption of the building of the temple in the time of Cyrus (536-529) till the second year of Darius (520).
- Chap. vi.-vii. = Ezra v.-vi.: Resumption and completion of the rebuilding of the temple in the sixth year of Darius (516).
- Chap. viii. - ix. 36 = Ezra vii. - x.: Return of Ezra with a train of exiles in the seventh year of Artaxerxes (458); commencement of Ezra's operations.
- Chap. ix. 37-55 = Neh. vii. 73-viii. 13: Public reading of the law by Ezra

According to this survey the reviser of the canonical Ezra took in hand the following changes: 1. The portion chap. iv. 7-24 of the canonical Ezra is removed to an earlier place. 2. The portion chaps. iii.-v. 6 of the Greek Ezra is interpolated from an unknown source. 3. The book opens with 2 Chron. xxxv.-xxxvi. 4. Neh. vii. 73-viii. 13 is added at the close. By the two first-named operations the confusion partly begotten by the canonical Ezra is considerably increased. For in this latter the portion chap. iv. 6-23 stands out of place. It belongs to a much later period, and treats not of the interruption of the rebuilding of the temple, but of an interruption in the building of the walls. The editor of the Greek Ezra has indeed rescued this passage from the connection in which it is incorrectly placed, but

only to transpose it to a position if possible still more erroneous, taking at the same time the liberty of adding to it by way of completion the interruption of the building of the temple. Not however contented with this, he has also interpolated the paragraph chaps. iii.—v. 6, which transposes us to the times of Darius, while subsequently (v. 7–70) the times of Cyrus are again spoken of. Thus then the history goes directly backwards; first we have (ii. 15–25) Artaxerxes, then (iii.—v. 6) Darius, and lastly (v. 7–70) Cyrus. And in the last-named portion we are told in the most unembarrassed manner that Zerubbabel returned with the exiles in the time of Cyrus (comp. v. 8, 67–70), while previously it was expressly stated that Zerubbabel received permission for their return from the special favour of Darius. With respect to the documents which were in the hands of our compiler only two things remain to be noticed: 1. That he did not translate the canonical Ezra from the Hebrew (so Fritzsche and most others), but compiled from the Septuagint (so rightly Keil, *Einkl.* 3rd ed. p. 704 sq.). 2. That he certainly discovered beforehand the portion chaps. iii.—v. 6, since it stands in direct opposition to the rest of the narrative. It seems to be a Greek original and not a translation from the Hebrew. The *object* of the whole compilation has been on the whole correctly expressed by Bertholdt (*Einkl.* iii. 1011): “He intended to compile from older works a history of the temple from the last epoch of the legal worship to its rebuilding and the restoration of the prescribed ritual therein.” Evidently however he meant to give also still more concerning Nehemiah, for the abrupt conclusion could not possibly have been intentional. With respect to the date of the book, all that can be said is, that it was already used by Josephus (*Antt.* xi. 1–5).

Josephus in his account of the restoration of the theocracy (*Antt.* xi. 1–5) entirely conforms to the course of this Greek Ezra. For he brings what is contained in chaps. ii. 15–25 and iii.—v. 6 of this book into the same position and the same order,

i.e. interpolates it between the first and second chapters of the canonical Ezra (*Antt.* xi. 2-3). In so doing however he does not proceed without historical criticism, for he simply changes Artaxerxes, who in the Greek Ezra is inserted in a quite impossible place, into Cambyses, so as to restore the correct order: Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius. He removes the further historical stumbling-block of the Greek Ezra, of Cyrus re-appearing after Darius, by doing away with Cyrus in this place and making the return of the exiles first take place under Darius. This indeed restores the correct order of the Persian kings, but a narrative is thus concocted, which differs still more widely from actual history than that of the Greek Ezra itself.

Apparently this book was generally and from the first used in the Christian Church also. Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 124: 'Ενταῦθα Ζοροβάβελ σοφίᾳ νικήσας τοὺς ἀνταγωνιστὰς τυγχάνει παρὰ Δαρείου ἀνησάμενος ἀνανέωσιν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ μετὰ "Εσδρα εἰς τὴν πατρίαν γῆν ἀναζεύγνυσι (can only refer to chaps. iii. iv. of the Greek Ezra). Origenes, *Comment. in Johann.* vol. vi. c. 1 (Lommatzsch, i. 174): Καὶ κατὰ τοὺς "Εσδρα χρόνους, ὅτε νικᾷ ἡ ἀλήθεια τὸν αἶνον καὶ τὸν ἐχθρὸν βασιλέα καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας, ἀνοικοδομεῖται ὁ ναὸς τῷ θεῷ (comp. *Esra graec.* iv. 33 sqq.). Idem, *in Josuam homil.* ix. 10 (Lommatzsch, xi. 100): et nos dicamus, sicut in Esdra scriptum est, quia "a te domine est victoria et ego servus tuus, benedictus es deus veritatis" (*Esra graec.* iv. 59-60). *Cyprian epist.* lxxiv. 9: Et apud Hesdram veritas vicit, sicut scriptum est: "Veritas manet et invalescit in aeternum et vivit et obtinet in saecula saeculorum," etc. (*Esra graec.* iv. 38-40). For numerous passages from later Fathers see Pohlmann, *Tüb. Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1859, p. 263 sqq. In the authorized editions of the Vulgate, the book is placed in the Appendix to the Bible *after* the New Testament.

The book is sometimes entitled the *first* Book of Ezra (so the Greek MSS.: "Εσδρας α'), sometimes the *third* Book of Ezra, the canonical Books of Ezra and Nehemiah being reckoned the first and second (so Jerome [*praeef. in version. libr. Esrae*, ed. Vallarsi, ix. 1524: nec quemquam moveat, quod, unus a nobis editus liber est; nec apocryphorum tertii et quarti somniis delectetur], and especially the authorized editions of the Vulgate).

Among the Greek *manuscripts* the *Vaticanus* (called No. 2 in Fritzsche's edition, as well as by Holmes and Parsons) and the *Alexandrinus* (No. 3) hold the first rank, the book not being contained in the Sinaiticus. On the editions, see above, pp. 10 and 11.

Ancient translations: 1. The old Latin preserved in two recensions, one of which is found in the manuscripts and

editions of the Vulgate, the other in the *cod. Colbertinus* 3703. Both texts in Sabatier, *Biblorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. iii. (in the Appendix after the New Testament corresponding to the position in the Vulgate). On the relation of both to one another, see Fritzsche, *Handb.* i. 10. 2. The Syriac, on which comp. p. 11. This book is not contained in the large Milan Peshito manuscripts.

On the exegesis in general, see p. 11. Commentary: Fritzsche, *Exeget. Handbuch zu den Apokryphen*, Part i. Leipzig 1851.

Separate investigations: [Trendelenburg] "On the apocryphal Esras" (Eichhorn's *Allg. Biblioth. der bibl. Literatur*, vol. i. 1787, pp. 178–232). Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie*, vol. ii. (1834) pp. 116–125. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, i. 320 sqq., iii. 72 sqq. Treuenfels, "Ueber das apokryphische Buch Esra" (Fürst's *Literaturbl. des Orients*, 1850, Nos. 15–18, 40–49). The same, "Entstehung des Esra apocryphus" (Fürst's *Orient*, 1851, Nos. 7–10). Pohlmann, "Ueber das Ansehen des apokryphischen dritten Buchs Esras" (*Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.* 1859, pp. 257–275). Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 163–167. Bissell, "The First Book of Esdras" (*Bibliotheca sacra*, 1877, pp. 209–228; reprinted in Bissell, *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament*, 1880, p. 62 sqq., Clark, Edinburgh). The Introductions of Eichhorn, Bertholdt, De Wette-Schrader, Keil, Reuss (see above, p. 12).

2. Additions to Esther.

The canonical Book of Esther relates how a Jewish virgin, a foster-daughter of Mordecai, was chosen for his wife by the Persian king Ahasuerus (Xerxes); how Haman, the prime minister of the king, published a decree in his name for the extirpation of all the Jews, and was already making preparations to hang Mordecai; how Mordecai however, who had formerly saved the king's life, was raised to great honour and Haman hanged on the gibbet destined for Mordecai, whereupon Mordecai by an edict promulgated in the king's name revoked the edict of Haman and gave permission to the Jews to destroy their enemies; and finally, how the Jewish feast of Purim was instituted for the commemoration of this wonderful deliverance of the Jews. A multitude of passages are interpolated in the Greek revision of the book, *e.g.* the edict

of Haman, a prayer of Mordecai and a prayer of Esther, the edict of Mordecai and the like. In these portions the spirit of the narrative is maintained and they present nothing needing remark. There is no reason for adopting the view of a Hebrew model (so *e.g.* Langen). According to the superscription of the Greek edition it was the work of Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemy of Jerusalem, and was brought to Egypt in the fourth year of King Ptolemy and Cleopatra by the priest Dositheus and his son Ptolemy. Since no less than four Ptolemies had a Cleopatra to wife, the information, even if it be regarded as trustworthy, is not of much chronological value. It is certain only that Josephus was already acquainted with the Greek revision with the additions.

Josephus in his reproduction of its contents (*Antt.* xi. 6) has admitted also all the additions of the Greek revision.

Origenes, *Epist. ad African.* c. 3, mentions these additions and expressly names the most important; assuming as self-evident the canonicity of the book in this form (the additions included). He also mentions, *De oratione*, c. 13 (Lommatzsch, xvii. 134), the prayers of Mordecai and Esther inserted between chaps. iv. and v., and gives in the same work, c. 14 (Lommatzsch, xvii. 143), the first words of both prayers.

The Greek text is extant in two widely differing recensions: (1) the common, which is supported by the best manuscripts, the Vaticanus (No. 2), the Alexandrinus (No. 3) and the Sinaiticus (No. 10); and (2) a much retouched one in *codd.* 19, 93, 108 (or more precisely 19, 93^a and 108^b, the last two manuscripts containing both the common and the touched-up texts). Langen thought he could prove that Josephus already had access to the latter. But Josephus chiefly coincides with the common text (comp. *e.g.* the portion, *Esth.* ii. 21-23 = *Joseph. Antt.* xi. 6. 4, which is entirely expunged from the revised text, the name of the eunuch Achmethaios, *Esth.* iv. 5 = *Joseph. Antt.* xi. 6. 4, which is also absent in the revised text and other matters). It has also been rendered very probable by recent investigations, that the revised text is derived from Lucianus (see above, p. 165). If then one or two instances of contact between Josephus and the revised text are really not accidental, this would only prove that the words in question were formerly found in the common text also. Fritzsche published both texts, at first separately (*Ἑσθήρ, duplicem libri textum*, ed. O. F. Fritzsche, Zurich 1848), then in his edition of the *Libri*

apocryphi Vet. Test. graece (1871). Comp. on the editions, p. 10 above.

Ancient translations. 1. *The Latin.* (a) The old Latin according to a *cod. Corbeiensis* with the various readings of two other manuscripts in Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. i. The beginning of the book, according to the same translation, is also found in *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, vol. i. (1873), *Florileg.* pp. 287–289. On the character of the translation, see Fritzsche, *Exeget. Handb.* i. 74 sq. (b) The translation of Jerome, who, in his translation of the book from the Hebrew, gives also a free Latin version of the Greek additions, but places them all at the end, and marks them with the obelus (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ix. 1581: Quae habentur in Hebraeo, plena fide expressi. Haec autem, quae sequuntur, scripta reperi in editione vulgata, quae Graecorum lingua et literis continetur . . . quod juxta consuetudinem nostram obelo ÷ id est veru praenotavimus). 2. The Syriac translation, see above, p. 11.

For the exegesis in general, see above, p. 11. Commentary: Fritzsche, *Exeget. Handbuch zu den Apokryphen*, Part i., Leipzig 1851. The other literature: Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (1832), pp. 120–122. Langen, “Die beiden griechischen Texte des Buches Esther” (*Theol. Quartalschr.* 1860, pp. 244–272). The same, *Die deuterokanonischen Stücke des Buches Esther*, Freiburg 1862. The introductory works of von Jahn, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Welte, Scholz, Nöldeke, De Wette-Schrader, Reusch, Keil, Kaulen, Kleinert, Reuss (see above, p. 12).

3. *Additions to Daniel.*

The Greek text of the Book of Daniel contains the following additions: (a) *The Prayer of Azariah and the Thanksgiving of the Three Children in the Furnace.* For when the three companions of Daniel were cast into the furnace (Dan. iii.), one of them, Azariah, who was also called Abed-Nego, first uttered a prayer for deliverance and, when this was heard, all three joined in a song of praise. The words of both are given. (b) *The History of Susannah.* A beautiful Jewess named Susannah, the wife of Jehoiakim, is, while bathing, surprised by two lustful Jewish elders, and then, when she cries for assistance, slanderously accused by them of having committed adultery with a youth. Upon the false

witness of the elders Susannah is condemned to death, but saved by the wisdom of the youthful Daniel, who procures a fresh investigation, and by a skilful examination convicts the elders of perjury. (c) *The History of Bel and the Dragon*. Properly two independent narratives, both of which are intended to expose the worthlessness and imposture of idolatrous worship. In the one, we are told how King Cyrus (so Theodotion, the king's name not being mentioned in the Septuagint text) was convinced by a clever contrivance of Daniel, that the image of Bel did not itself consume the food laid before it. In the other, how Daniel having fed the Dragon, to whom divine honours were paid by the Babylonians, with cakes made of pitch, fat, and hair, and so killed it, was cast into the den of lions, and there miraculously fed by the prophet Habakkuk, and after seven days drawn out of the pit unhurt. Of these fragments only the first (the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children) is properly speaking a completion of the canonical Book of Daniel, the two others having no internal connection with it. In the text of Theodotion the *History of Susannah* stands at the commencement of that book, the *History of Bel and the Dragon* at its close. This position is also evidenced by the Fathers (Hippolytus, Julius Africanus and Origen). Neither of the fragments gives occasion for assuming a Hebrew original. The *History of Susannah* is even very certainly a Greek original, as Julius Africanus and Porphyry already showed from the play upon the words *σχι̇νος* and *σχι̇ζειν* (vers. 54, 55), *πρι̇νος* and *πρι̇ειν* (vers. 58, 59) (African. *epist. ad Origen, Porphyry*. quoted by Jerome, *praef. comment. in Daniel*, ed. Vallarsi, 619).¹¹

Specially copious material is in existence for the *history of the use and canonical validity of these fragments in the Christian Church*.

Justin Martyr mentions, *Apol. i.*, Ananias, Azarias and Misael, the three companions of Daniel. But it is not clear from his

¹¹ The Catholic apologists from Origen (*Epist. ad African. c. vi. and xii.*) to Wiederholt (*Theol. Quartalschr.* 1869, pp. 290–321), have in vain endeavoured to do away with the proof furnished by this play upon words.

brief notice of them whether he was also acquainted with the additions.

Irenaeus and Tertullian quote both the History of Susannah and that of Bel and the Dragon. Irenaeus, iv. 26. 3: *audient eas quae sunt a Daniele propheta voces*, etc. (comp. Susanna, vers. 56 and 52, 53 according to Theodotion). Idem, iv. 5. 2: *Quem (Deum) et Daniel propheta, cum dixisset ei Cyrus rex Persarum: "Quare non adoras Bel?" annuntiavit dicens: "Quoniam," etc.* Tertullian, *De corona*, c. iv. (Susanna). Idem, *De idololatria*, c. xviii. (Bel and the Dragon); *de jejuniis*, c. vii *fin.* (the same).

Hippolytus in his commentary on Daniel deals also with the Greek additions. The explanation of the History of Susannah (*Opp.* ed. Lagarde, pp. 145-151) and a few notes on the Song of the Three Children (Lagarde, p. 186, fragm. 122, p. 201, fragm. 138) are extant. It is evident from the beginning of the notes on Susannah, that Hippolytus read this portion as the commencement of the Book of Daniel. See in general, Bardenhewer, *Des heiligen Hippolytus von Rom Commentar zum Buche Daniel*, Freiburg 1877; and Zahn, *Theol. Litztg.* 1877, p. 495 sqq.

Julius Africanus alone among the older Fathers disputes the canonicity of these fragments. In his *Epistola ad Origenem* (printed in the editions of Origen, e.g. in Lommatzsch, xvii. 17 sqq.) he calls Origen to account for appealing in a disputation to the History of Susannah, which is but a spurious addition to Daniel: *Θαυμάζω δὲ, πῶς ἔλαθέ σε τὸ μέρος τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦτο κίβδηλον ὄν . . . ἥδε ἡ περικοπὴ σὺν ἄλλαις δύο ταῖς ἐπὶ τῷ τέλει τῷ παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων εἰλημμένῳ Δανιὴλ οὐκ ἐμφέρεται.* The last remark refers, as appears from the reply of Origen, to the two pieces of Bel and of the Dragon. Hence Africanus read these at the close and the History of Susannah at the beginning of the book.

Origen in his reply (*Epistola ad Africanum*) seeks to defend the genuineness and canonicity of these pieces with a great amount of scholarship.¹² In so doing he mentions, not only the History of Susannah and those of Bel and the Dragon, but also the Prayer of Azariah, and the Song of the Three Children, and indeed speaks of them as standing in the midst of the text of Daniel, remarking that *all three were found both in the LXX. and in the text of Theodotion* (*Epist. ad African.* c. ii.). In the tenth book of his *Stromata* he gives an exegesis of the

¹² Wetstein in his separate edition of the letters (*Julii Africani de historia Susannae epistola ad Origenem et Origenis ad illum responsio*, ed. J. R. Wetstenius, Basil. 1674) incorrectly denies that Origen really desired to prove the canonicity of these fragments. See on the contrary the *Monitum* in de la Rue and Lommatzsch.

History of Susannah and that of Bel, from which Jerome makes extracts in his commentary on Daniel, chaps. xiii.-xiv. (Hieron. *Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, v. 730-736; also in Orig. *Opp.* ed. Lommatzsch, xvii. 70-75). All the fragments are elsewhere frequently quoted by Origen, and that according to the text of Theodotion.

(1) Susannah, *Comm. in Joann.* vol. xx. c. 5 (Lommatzsch, ii. 204); *ibid.* vol. xxviii. c. 4 (Lommatzsch, ii. 316); *Comm. in Matth.* series lat. c. 61 (Lommatzsch, iv. 347); *Comm. in Epist. ad Rom.* lib. iv. c. 2 (Lommatzsch, vi. 249); *Fragm. in Genes.* vol. iii. c. iv. (Lommatzsch, viii. 13); *in Genes. homil.* xv. 2 (Lommatzsch, viii. 261); *in Josuam homil.* xxii. 6 (Lommatzsch, xi. 190); *Selecta in Psalmos*, Ps. xxxvi. (xxxvii.) *homil.* iv. 2 (Lommatzsch, xii. 210); *in Ezekiel, homil.* vi. 3 (Lommatzsch, xiv. 82); *Selecta in Ezek.* c. 6 (Lommatzsch, xiv. 196). Comp. especially with respect to canonicity *in Levit. homil.* i. 1 (Lommatzsch, ix. 173) against those who adhere to the literal and historical sense of Scripture: sed tempus est nos adversus improbos presbyteros uti sanctae Susannae vocibus, quas illi quidem repudiantes historiam Susannae de catalogo divinorum voluminum desecarunt. Nos autem et suscipimus et opportune contra ipsos proferimus dicentes, "Angustiae mihi undique." (2) Prayer of Azariah and Song of the Three Children: *Comm. in Matth.* vol. xiii. c. 2 (Lommatzsch, iii. 211); *Comm. in Matth.* series lat. c. 62 (Lommatzsch, iv. 352); *Comm. in Epist. ad Rom.* lib. i. c. 10 (Lommatzsch, vi. 37); *ibid.* lib. ii. c. 9 (Lommatzsch, vi. 108); *ibid.* lib. vii. c. 1 (Lommatzsch, vii. 87); *De Oratione*, c. xiii. and xiv. (Lommatzsch, xvii. 134, 143). (3) Bel and the Dragon: *Exhortatio ad martyrium*, c. 33 (Lommatzsch, xx. 278).

Cyprian, *de dominica oratione*, c. 8, adduces the Song of the Three Children as a standard example of publica et communis oratio. Comp. also *De Lapsis*, c. 31. He quotes the story of Bel, *ad Fortunatum*, c. 11; and *Epist.* lviii. 5.

The Greek text used by the Fathers since Irenaeus was that of Theodotion, which has also passed into the manuscripts and editions of the LXX. (see above, p. 173). The genuine Septuagint text of Daniel is preserved to us in only one manuscript, a *cod. Chisianus*; and after the previous labours of others (Bianchini and Vincentius, *de Regibus*, see *Theol. Litztg.* 1877, p. 565) has been published for the first time by Simon de Magistris (*Daniel secundum LXX. ex tetraplis Origenis nunc primum editus e singulari Chisiano codice*, Rom. 1772). On this edition, which is not free from errors, are based the more recent ones, and also that of Hahn (*Δανιήλ κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα*, e *cod. Chisiano* ed. etc., H. A. Hahn, Lips. 1845). Still more incorrect is the text, in part formed from Holmes and Parsons'

Apparatus of Various Readings, which Tischendorf has added to his edition of the Septuagint. It is to Cozza (*Sacrorum Bibliorum vetustissima fragmenta Graeca et Latina*, ed. Cozza, pars iii. Romae 1877; comp. the notice of Gebhardt, *Theol. Litztg.* 1877, p. 565 sq.) that we are first indebted for a trustworthy impression of the MSS. *The Syriac translation of the hexaplarian LXX. text*, of which Daniel and other books have been preserved in a Milan manuscript, serves as a check and criticism of the *cod. Chisianus*. The Book of Daniel from this translation has already been published by Bugati (*Daniel secundum editionem LXX. interpretum ex Tetraplis desumptam, ex codice Syro-Estranghelo Bibliothecae Ambrosianae Syriace edidit*, etc., Caj. Bugatus, Mediol. 1788). A photo-lithographic copy of the whole manuscript has been published by Ceriani (*Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolithographice editus*, Mediol. 1874, as vol. vii. of the *Monum. sacra et prof.*). Fritzsche in his edition of the Apocrypha, gives both the Greek texts (LXX. and Theodotion) of Susannah, Bel and the Dragon, and the Septuagint only, with the various readings of Theodotion, of the Prayer of Azarias, and the Song of the Three Children, in which Theodotion has made but few alterations. Comp. on the editions of the Greek text (*i.e.* of Theodotion), p. 10 above.

Ancient translations. A *Vetus Latinus*, only fragmentary in Sabatier, *Biblior. sacror. Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. ii. The Greek original is Theodotion. Jerome has likewise translated the Greek additions from Theodotion and admitted them, marked with the obelus, into his translation of Daniel from the Hebrew. See his remarks, ed. Vallarsi, ix. 1376, 1399. On the editions of the Syriac common text, see above, p. 11. The Syriac translation of the Story of Bel and the Dragon, from a collection of Midrashim, is also found in Neubauer, *The Book of Tobit*, 1878, pp. 39–43.

For the exegesis in general, see above, p. 11. Commentary: Fritzsche, *Exeget. Handbuch zu den Apocryphen*, Pt. i. Leipzig 1851. The other literature: Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (1832), p. 122 sq. Delitzsch, *De Habacuci prophetae vita atque aetate* (Lips. 1842), pp. 23 sqq., 105 sqq. Frankel, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1868, pp. 440–449 (on Susannah). Wiederholt, *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1869, pp. 287 sqq., 377 sqq. (History of Susannah); 1871, p. 373 sqq. (Prayer of Azarias and Song of the Three Children); 1872, p. 554 sqq. (Bel and the Dragon). Rohling, *Das Buch des Propheten Daniel*, 1876. Brüll, "Das apokryphische Susannabuch" (*Jahrb. für jüd. Gesch. und Literatur*, Pt. iii. 1877, pp. 1–69; also separate). The Introductions of Jahn, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Welte, Scholz,

Nöldeke, De Wette-Schrader, Reusch, Keil, Kaulen, Kleinert, Reuss (see above, p. 12).

4. *The Prayer of Manasseh.*

In like manner as the prayers of Mordecai and Esther were interpolated as supplements to the Book of Esther, and the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children to that of Daniel, so was a prayer of Manasseh, in which the king in his captivity humbly confesses his sin before God and prays for pardon, composed as a completion of 2 Chron. xxxiii. 12, 13. There was the more occasion for the composition of such a prayer, since it is stated in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 18, 19, that the Prayer of Manasseh is written in the history of the kings of Israel and in the Chronicle of Hosai. The prayer stands in most manuscripts in the appendix to the Psalms, where many other similar fragments are collected (so e.g. in the *cod. Alexandrinus*).

The Prayer is first quoted in the *Constitut. apostol.* ii. 22, where it is given in its literal entirety. For later Christian testimony to its canonicity, see Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græc.* ed. Harles, iii. 732 sq. In the authorized Romish Vulgate it is in the appendix to the Bible, after the New Testament (like 3 and 4 Ezra).

The Latin translation, which has passed into the Vulgate, is "of quite another kind from the usual old Latin, and is certainly of more recent origin" (Fritzsche, i. 159). Sabatier has compared three manuscripts for it (*Biblior. sacrar. Lat. vers. ant.* iii. 1038 sq.).

The editions and the exegesis are the same as of the other Apocrypha. Commentary: Fritzsche, *Exeget. Handbuch zu den Apocryphen*, Pt. i. Leipzig 1851.

For other legends (Jewish and Christian) with respect to Manasseh, see Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* i. 1100–1102. Id. *Biblioth. gr.* ed. Harl. iii. 732 sq. Fritzsche, *Handb.* i. 158.

5. *The Book of Baruch.*

The Greek Book of Baruch properly belongs to the class of Pseudepigraphic prophets, and is distinguished among them by its very meritorious contents. We place it here as being,

at least according to its second half, of Graeco-Jewish origin, and as having been admitted into the Greek Bible as a canonical book.

The whole claims to be the composition of Baruch, the confidential friend and companion of the prophet Jeremiah. Its contents are tolerably miscellaneous, and are divided into two halves, the second of which again comprises two sections. The first half (chaps. i. 1-iii. 8) begins with a superscription, in which what follows is described as a Book of Baruch, which he wrote in the fifth year after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans (i. 1, 2). This book was read by Baruch before King Jeconiah and all the exiles in Babylon; and the reading produced such an impression, that it was resolved to send money to Jerusalem, that sacrifices and prayers might there be offered for King Nebuchadnezzar and his son Belshazzar. At the same time the Jews dwelling in Jerusalem were enjoined to read out in the temple on the feast days the writing therewith sent (i. 3-14). This writing, which is next given in full, is evidently identical with that read by Baruch, and therefore announced in the superscription¹⁸ It is *an ample confession of sin on the part of the exiles*, who recognise in the fearful fate which has overtaken themselves and the holy city, the righteous chastisement of God for their sins, and entreat Him again to show them favour. They confess especially that their disobedience to the King of Babylon was a rebellion against God Himself, because it was His will that Israel should obey the King of Babylon (ii. 21-24). The second half of the book (chaps. iii. 9-v. 9) contains *instruction and consolation for the humbled people*: (a) Instruction—Israel is humbled, because they have forsaken

¹⁸ The writing announced in the superscription and read by Baruch cannot, as many critics suppose, be chap. iii. 7 sqq. For the effect of the reading is, that a sacrifice for Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar is resolved upon, and this can only refer to chap. ii. 21-24. The superscription i. 1, 2, too, is by no means in accordance with iii. 9 sqq., this latter section giving no kind of hint of its having been written by Baruch. Comp. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften alten Testaments*, § 510.

the source of wisdom. True wisdom is with God alone. To it must the people return (iii. 9–iv. 4). (b) Consolation—Jerusalem is not laid waste for ever, nor are the people to be always in captivity. They must take courage, for the scattered members shall again be assembled in the Holy Land (iv. 5–v. 9).

The second half is joined to the first without any intervening matter at chap. iii. 9. An internal connection only so far exists, that both halves presuppose the same historical situation, viz. the desolation of Jerusalem and the carrying away of the people into captivity. In other respects however they stand in no connection with each other, and it is hardly conceivable that they formed from the first part of the same whole. To this must be added, that the style and mode of expression widely differ, being in the first half Hebraistic, and in the second fluent and rhetorical Greek. Hence Fritzsche, Hitzig, Kneucker, Hilgenfeld and Reuss have correctly inferred, that the two halves are the works of different authors. Nay, one might feel inclined, with Hitzig, Kneucker and Hilgenfeld, to regard even the first half as no single work, but to look upon chap. i. 3–14 as a later interpolation. For it cannot be denied that the narrative of the reading of the Book of Baruch and of the effect produced thereby, comes in like an interruption between i. 1, 2 and i. 15–iii. 8. After the superscription i. 1, 2, the book itself is expected. A discrepancy of statement also ensues owing to the inserted narrative, the destruction of the temple being assumed by the book itself (i. 2, ii. 26), and the continuance of the sacrificial service by the narrative (i. 10–14). But lastly, all these inconsistencies are possible in one and the same author; and other matters, such especially as the like dependence on Daniel in i. 11, 12 and i. 15–ii. 20 favour identity of authorship.

Most of the older critics adopt the view of a Hebrew original for the whole; and Kneucker, in spite of his assumption of three different composers, firmly maintains it, nay,

tries with much care to reconstruct the Hebrew original. There are however sufficient points of contact for this *in the first half only*. The second half is evidently a Greek original. Hence we are constrained, with Fritzsche, Hilgenfeld and Reuss, to admit, concerning the origin of this book, that its first half was originally composed in Hebrew, then translated into Greek, and completed by the addition of the second half.

In determining the *date of its composition*, its close dependence on the Book of Daniel is decisive. There are in it correspondences with the latter, which make the employment of it by the author of Baruch indubitable. Especially is there an almost verbal agreement between Dan. ix. 7-10 and Baruch i. 15-18. The juxtaposition too of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar is common to both books (Dan. v. 2 sqq. = Baruch i. 11, 12). That so thoroughly original and creative a mind however as the author of the Book of Daniel should have copied from the Book of Baruch is certainly not to be admitted. Thus we have already arrived at the Maccabaeian period, and most Protestant critics stop there (so *e.g.* Fritzsche, Schrader, Keil). But the situation assumed in the Book of Baruch by no means agrees with the Maccabaeian era. The Book of Baruch, and especially its first half, with which we are first of all concerned, *presupposes* the destruction of Jerusalem and the leading of the people into captivity (i. 2, ii. 23, 26). In this catastrophe the people recognise a judgment of God for their sins, and particularly for their rebellion against the heathen authority, which God Himself had set over Israel (ii. 21-24). The penitent people hasten therefore to order sacrifices and prayers for their heathen rulers (i. 10, 11). All this — as the destruction by the Chaldeans is out of question — only suits the time *after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus*. This very catastrophe was moreover brought about by the rebellion of the people against the heathen authorities. And the special act of rebellion was, as Josephus expressly states, the doing away with the daily sacrifice for the Roman

emperor (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 2-4; comp. above, Div. ii. vol. i p. 302 sq.). In this political revolution our author saw a rebellion against the will of God, and therefore in the fearful catastrophe, the righteous judgment of God upon it. And he sought, by all he relates of the exiles in the time of Baruch, to bring this view to bear upon his fellow-countrymen. It must therefore certainly be admitted, as by Hitzig and Kneucker, that this book was written after the year A.D. 70. For the quite non-historical juxtaposition of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar, recalling the relation of Vespasian and Titus, also agrees with that date. The narrative that in the straits of war parents ate the flesh of their children (ii. 3) frequently recurs indeed in the description of the horrors of war, but is also found just in the description of the siege of A.D. 70 by Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* vi. 3. 4).

What has been said applies chiefly to only the first half of the book. But the second half also essentially assumes the same situation, viz. the desolation of Jerusalem and the leading of the people into captivity (iv. 10-16). Its object is to give instruction and consolation in view of these events. Hence its composition cannot well be placed much later than that of the first half. At all events this second half is later than the Salomonian Psalter. For Baruch v. agrees almost verbally with Psalt. Salom. xi.; and the dependence must, by reason of the psalm-like character and the probably primitive Hebrew of the Salomonian Psalter, be sought for on the side of the Book of Baruch.

The fact that it found acceptance in the Christian Church is not opposed to our conclusion as to the somewhat recent composition of the book. For exactly the same thing took place in the case of the Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Ezra.

The existence of a Hebrew text of this book is disputed by Jerome, see *praef. comment. in Jerem.* (Vallarsi, iv. 834): *Libellum autem Baruch, qui vulgo editioni Septuaginta copulatur nec habetur apud Hebraeos. Idem, praef. in version.*

Jerem. (Vallarsi, ix. 783): *Librum autem Baruch notarii ejus, qui apud Hebraeos nec legitur nec habetur.* So too Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus*, § 5: τῶν θρῆνων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν Βαρούχ, εἰ καὶ οὐ κεῖνται ἐπιστολαὶ παρ' Ἑβραίοις. But both Jerome and Epiphanius for the most part try only to prove that the book was not in the Hebrew canon. Certainly they seem to have known of no Hebrew text at all, but that does not prove that none ever existed. For its existence may be cited the remark found three times in the Milan manuscript of the *Syrus hexaplaris* (on i. 17 and ii. 3), "this is not in the Hebrew" (see Ceriani's notes to his edition in the *Monum. sacra et prof.* i. 1, 1861).

Among the Jews (*i.e.* among the Hellenistic Jews?) this book, together with the Lamentations of Jeremiah, was, according to the testimony of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, read at public worship on the 10th Gorpaios (by which is certainly meant the 10th Ab, the day of the destruction of Jerusalem), *Const. apost.* v. 20: καὶ γὰρ καὶ νῦν δεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς Γορπιαίου συναθροίζομενοι τοὺς θρῆνους Ἱερεμίου ἀναγινώσκουσιν . . . καὶ τὸν Βαρούχ. In the Syriac text of the *Const. apost.* the Book of Baruch, it is true, is not named. See Bunsen, *Analecta Antenicaena*, ii. 187. On the date of the 10th Gorpaios, comp. also Freudenthal, *Die Flavii Josephus beigelegte Schrift über die Herrschaft der Vernunft* (1869), p. 147 sq.

On its use in the Christian Church, see the copious proofs in Reusch, *Erklärung des Buch's Baruch* (1853), pp. 1-21 and 268 sqq. The book is very frequently quoted as a *work of the prophet Jeremiah*, because it was from early times combined with his book. The passage concerning the appearance of God upon earth (Bar. iii. 37: μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤφθη καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συναεστράφη), which Kneucker rightly regards as a Christian gloss, was a favourite one with the Fathers. The oldest quotation is in Athenagoras, *Suppl.* c. 9, where Bar. iii. 35 is cited as the saying of a προφήτης. Irenaeus, iv. 20, refers to Bar. iii. 37. He also quotes (v. 35. 1) Bar. iv. 36 to v. *fin.* with the formula, significavit Jeremias propheta dicens. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Paedag.* i. 10. 91, 92, quotes various passages of this book as sayings of the prophet Jeremiah. In *Paedag.* ii. 3. 36 he quotes Bar. iii. 16-19 with the formula ἡ θεία που λέγει γραφή. Hippolytus mentions in his work *Contra Noetum*, that Noetus and his followers appealed to Bar. iii. 35-37, among other passages, in proof of their patripassian Christology (*Hippol.* ed. Lagarde, p. 44). He then, to help himself out of difficulty, himself gives (ed. Lagarde, p. 47) a very sophistical interpretation of the passage. Hence the book is for Hippolytus as well as Noetus a standard

authority. Origenes, in *Jerem. homil.* vii. 3 (Lommatzsch, xv. 190): *γέγραπται* "ἀκούε Ἰσραὴλ κ.τ.λ." = Bar. iii. 9-13. Idem, *Selecta in Jerem.* c. 31 (Lommatzsch, xv. 456): *γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Βαρούχ* "τί ὅτι ἐν γῇ κ.τ.λ." = Bar. iii. 10. Commodian. *Carmen apologet.* (ed. Ludwig) vers. 367, 368: Hieremias ait: Hic deus est, etc. = Bar. iii. 35-37. Cyprian. *Testim.* ii. 6: Item apud Hieremiam prophetam: Hic deus noster, etc. = Bar. iii. 35-37. Material from later Fathers will be found in Reusch as above quoted, to which need only be added *Altercatio Simonis Judaei et Theophili Christiani*, ed. Harnack, p. 17 (in Gebhardt and Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. i. No. 3, 1883).

Among the *Greek manuscripts* the most important are: the *Vaticanus* (which however, not having been collated for this book by Holmes and Parsons, has also been paid no regard to in Fritzsche's edition), the *Alexandrinus* (No. iii. in Holmes and Parsons) and the *Marchalianus* (No. xii.). The Sinaiticus does not contain the Book of Baruch. On the editions, see above, p. 10.

Ancient translations. 1. The Latin which is extant in two widely differing recensions: (a) that which has passed into the Vulgate, and (b) one first published by Joseph Caro, Rome 1688. The latter according to three MSS. in Sabatier, *Biblior. sacror. Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. ii. p. 734 sqq. Also in *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, vol. i. (1873), *Florileg.* pp. 284-287. On the relation of the two to each other, see Fritzsche, *Handb.* i. 175. Reusch, *Erklärung des Buchs Baruch*, p. 88 sq. Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch*, p. 157 sqq. 2. The two *Syriac translations*, (a) the *Peshito* or the Syriac common text, comp. above, p. 11. (b) The *Syrus hexaplaris*, contained for this book in the Milan manuscript of the *Syrus hexaplaris*. The Book of Baruch with the letter of Jeremiah of this MS. were first published by Ceriani (*Monumenta sacra et profana*, vol. i. fasc. i. 1861). Also in the photo-lithographic copy of the entire manuscript, see above, p. 187. 3. A Coptic translation published by Brugsch (*Zeitschr. für ägyptische Sprache und Alterthumskunde*, 10-12th year, 1872-1874, comp. 1876, p. 148).

The exegesis in general, see above, p. 11. Commentaries: Fritzsche, *Exeget. Handb. zu den Apokryphen*, Part i. Leipzig 1851. Reusch, *Erklärung des Buchs Baruch*, Freiburg 1853. Ewald, *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes*, vol. iii. (2nd ed. 1868), pp. 251-298. Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch, Geschichte und Kritik, Uebersetzung und Erklärung*, Leipzig 1879. The other literature: Hävernicks, *De libro Baruchi apocrypho comm. crit.* Regim. 1843. Hitzig, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1860, pp. 262-273. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. iv. (1864) p. 265 sqq. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* vol.

v. 1862, pp. 199–203; xxii. 1879, pp. 437–454; xxiii. 1880, pp. 412–422. Kneucker, the same periodical, 1880, pp. 309–323. The Introductions of Jahne, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Welte, Scholz, De Wette-Schrader, Reusch, Keil, Kaulen, Kleinert, Reuss (see above, p. 12).

6. *The Letter of Jeremiah.*

The letter of Jeremiah, which is said to have been written to the exiles destined to be led away to Babylon, is a *warning against idolatry*, turning upon the theme, that images of wood, silver and gold, are the weak, powerless and perishable creatures of man's hand, which can absolutely do neither good nor harm. The author seeks by these particulars to restrain his co-religionists in the Dispersion from all participation in heathen rites. This small fragment is certainly of Greek origin.

Many have seen in the passage 2 Macc. i. 1 sqq. a *reference to this letter*. But what is there said does not actually suit it. When Origen asserts, that the Lamentations and "the letter" also were combined in the Hebrew canon with the Book of Jeremiah (Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 25. 2: 'Ιερεμίας σὺν θρήνοις καὶ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ἐν ἑνί), this certainly rests upon an oversight. Origen only means to say, that the writings of Jeremiah were reckoned by the Jews as *one*, so that the number twenty-two is consequently that of the collected books of Holy Scripture. *Christian quotations*: Tertullian, *Scorpiace*, c. 8. Cyprian, *De dominica oratione*, c. 5, and later writers.

In the majority of editions and manuscripts, the letter is appended to the Book of Baruch (in the Vulgate as its sixth chapter). Hence what has been said of manuscripts, editions, ancient translations and exegesis with respect to that book applies almost throughout in this case.

III. HISTORICAL LITERATURE.

The literary productions as yet discussed are in part compilations, in part imitations of older scriptural works. Hence there is but little specifically "Hellenistic" to be observed in them. The peculiarity of Judæo-Hellenistic literature is apparent in an entirely different manner in

those works, which incline in form towards non-scriptural Greek models and are thus found in the department of historical, poetic and philosophic literature. And first for the historical. Pharisaic Judaism as such had scarcely an interest in history. It saw in history merely an instruction, a warning, how God ought to be served. Hellenistic Judaism was certainly in a far higher degree interested in history as such. A knowledge of the history of the past formed part of the culture of the times. And no people could lay claim to be reckoned among the civilised nations, unless they could point to an old and imposing history. Even nations hitherto regarded as barbarian now compiled their histories and clad them in Greek garments for the purpose of making them accessible to the entire cultured world. The Hellenistic Jews also took their part in such efforts. They too worked up their sacred history for the instruction of both their own fellow-countrymen and the non-Jewish world. The most comprehensive work of the kind, with which we are acquainted, is the great historical work of Josephus. He had however a series of predecessors, who laboured some upon longer, some upon shorter periods of Jewish history in various forms. Of these some set to work in modest annalistic manner (Demetrius), some with fantastic and legendary embellishments in *majorem Judaeorum gloriam* (Eupolemus, Artapanus), while some sought in a philosophical manner to represent the great Jewish lawgiver as the greatest of philosophers, nay as the father of all philosophy (Philo). But the Greek Jews occupied themselves not only with the older Jewish history, but also depicted—as Pharisaic Judaism had ceased to do—important occurrences, which they had as contemporaries experienced, for the purpose of transmitting them to posterity (Jason of Cyrene, Philo, Josephus, Justus of Tiberias). Many who carried on authorship as a vocation were active in both departments. We therefore here place together historical works of both kinds, viz. compilations of the older sacred history and delineations of contemporary events.

The most ancient of these Judæo-Hellenistic historians have been only rescued from utter oblivion by Alexander Polyhistor. This voluminous writer, who lived about the years 80–40 B.C. (according to the statements of Suidas, *Lex. s.v.* Ἀλέξανδρος, and Sueton. *De gramm.* c. 20, comp. Müller, *Fragm.* iii. 206, and Unger, *Philologus*, 1884, p. 528 sqq.), composed among other works one *περὶ Ἰουδαίων*, in which he strung together, apparently with scarcely any additions of his own, extracts from foreign authors concerning the Jews. Eusebius in his turn embodied in his *Praeparatio evangelica* (ix. 17–39) a large portion of this collection of extracts. And it is to this circumstance, that we are almost entirely indebted for our acquaintance with the oldest Judæo-Hellenistic and Samaritan compilations of scriptural history whether in poetic or prosaic form, with those of Demetrius, Eupolemus, Artapanus, Aristéas, Kleodemus, Philo, Theodotus and Ezekiel. Besides Eusebius, Clemens Alexandrinus also once quotes Alexander's work *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* (*Strom.* i. 21. 130); and he undoubtedly makes use of it, even when he quotes Demetrius, Philo, Eupolemus, Artapanus and Ezekiel, from whom Alexander gives extracts (*Strom.* i. 21. 141, 23. 153–156). The quotation also in Josephus, *Antt.* i. 15, is certainly derived from the work *περὶ Ἰουδαίων*, with which Josephus elsewhere betrays his acquaintance (*contra Apion.* i. 23, and various traces in the *Antiquities*). But this is all that is preserved of independent quotation from Alexander's work. The extracts in Eusebius are in chronological order. They begin with fragments on the history of Abraham from Eupolemus, Artapanus, Molon, Philo, Kleodemus. Then follow portions on the history of Jacob from Demetrius and Theodotus, then others on Joseph from Artapanus and Philo. That this order is not first derived from Eusebius, but was followed by Alexander Polyhistor, is shown by the nature of the text. For the single portions are joined together by the connecting words of Alexander himself.

This is moreover confirmed by a comparison of the quotations in Clemens Alexandrinus. For as in Eusebius so in Clemens Alexandrinus the extracts on the history of Moses follow each other in direct succession:—

Eupolemus = Euseb. ix. 26 = Clemens, *Str.* i. 23. 153.

Artapanus = Euseb. ix. 27 = Clemens, *Str.* i. 23. 154.

Ezekiel = Euseb. ix. 28 = Clemens, *Str.* i. 23. 155, 156.

Hence we see that this is the original order of Alexander Polyhistor. The genuineness of Alexander's work has of late been frequently disputed, especially by Rauch and Cruice. It is thought inconceivable, that a heathen author like Alexander should have had so special an interest in Jewish affairs; it is also thought strange that he should call the Old Testament Scriptures *ἱερὰ βιβλία* (Euseb. ix. 24, 29. 15), and that he should here give such detailed accounts of Jewish history, while he elsewhere betrays the strangest ignorance of it. Its genuineness has been defended against these objections by Hulleman (p. 156 sq.), Müller (*Fragm.* iii. 209), and especially with convincing proofs by Freudenthal (pp. 174–184). The question is moreover one of minor importance, since it is tolerably indifferent whether these extracts were collected by Alexander or by some one else; for in either case the extraordinary differences in form and contents existing in these fragments is a guarantee, that we have here to deal with extracts from works then actually existing and not with the single work of a forger. Only the determination of the date would be affected, if it could be really proved, that the collection was not the production of Alexander Polyhistor, inasmuch as the time of Alexander would then cease to be a limit. The fragments in themselves furnish no cause for relegating them to a later date. For the most recent of the authors, from whom the extracts are made, and whose date can be determined independently of Alexander, is Apollonius Molon (Euseb. ix. 19), a Greek orator of probably about 120–100 B.C. (see No. vi. below).

References to Jewish affairs are also found in other works of Alexander Polyhistor. He quotes the Jewish Sibyl in his Chaldaean ancient history (Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schöne, i. 23. Cyrill. *adv. Julian.* ed. Spanh. p. 9^c. Syncell. ed. Dindorf, i. 81. Comp. Joseph. *Antt.* i. 4. 3; Freudenthal, p. 25 sq.). In his work on Italy is found the odd assertion, that the Jewish law was derived from a female named Moso (Suidas, *Lex. s.v.* 'Αλέξανδρος. Müller, *Fragm.* n. 25); and to his work on Syria belongs probably the information that Judaea received its name from Juda and Idumaea, the children of Semiramis (Steph. *Byz. s.v.* 'Ιουδαία. Müller, *Fragm.* n. 98-102). It is just these strange statements which have given rise to the denial of Alexander's authorship of the work *περὶ 'Ιουδαίων*—but very incorrectly, for he simply copied what he found in his authorities. Consequently, according to their nature, his information is now correct now incorrect. It rests upon only a somewhat wanton combination, when the pseudo-Justinian *Cohort. ad Graec.* c. 9 ascribes also to Alexander a statement concerning the date of Moses (see my article on "Julius Africanus as the source of the pseudo-Justinian *Cohortatio ad Graecos*," in Brieger's *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.* vol. ii. 1878, p. 319 sqq.).

The text of the fragment *περὶ 'Ιουδαίων* is in Euseb. *Evangelicae Praeparationis libri*, xv. ed. Gaisford, 4 vols. Oxford 1843. Clementis Alex. *Opera*, ed. Dindorf, 4 vols. Oxford 1869. Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, vol. iii. pp. 211-230. The prose fragments, partly according to a recent collation of manuscripts, are best given in Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyhistor*, pp. 219-236. On the manuscripts and editions of Eusebius, see Freudenthal, pp. 199-202.

Comp. in general: Rauch, *De Alexandri Polyhistoris vita atque scriptis*, Heidelb. 1843, quoted by Müller and others as "Rumpf." Cruice, *De Fl. Josephi in auctoribus contra Apionem afferendis fide et auctoritate* (Paris 1844), pp. 20-30. Hulleman, "De Corn. Alexandro Polyhistore" (*Miscellanea philologa et paedagoga edd. gymnasiorum Batavorum doctores*, vol. i. 1849, pp. 87-178). C. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iii. 206-244. Vaillant, *De historicis qui ante Josephum Judaicas res scripsere, nempe Aristea, Demetrio, Eupolemo, Hecataeo Abderita, Cleodemo, Artapano, Justo Tiberiensi, Cornelio Alexandro Polyhistore* (Paris 1851, Didot), pp. 88-98 (a follower of Cruice). Creuzer, *Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1853, p. 76 sqq. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 570 sqq. Westermann in Pauly's *Real-Enc. der class. Alterthums-wissensch.* i. 1 (2nd ed. 1864), p. 734 sq. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste judaischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke*, Bresl.

1875. Reuss, *Gesch. der heiligen Schriften A. T.'s* (1881), § 520, 521. Unger, "Wann schrieb Alexander Polyhistor?" (*Philologus*, vol. xliii. 1884, pp. 528-531).

1. *Demetrius.*

In the same century in which Berosus composed the ancient history of the Chaldaeans, and Manetho that of the Egyptians, but about sixty years later, Demetrius, a Jewish Hellenist, compiled in a brief chronological form a history of Israel, his work being equally with theirs according to the sacred records. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 141 states its title to have been *περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων*. And it can be scarcely a reason for doubting the correctness of this title, that the fragments deal almost all with only the most ancient period (so Freudenthal, p. 205 sq.). For Justus of Tiberias *e.g.* also treated of the time of Moses in his Chronicle of the Jewish kings. The first fragment in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 21 concerns the history of Jacob from his emigration to Mesopotamia till his death. At the close the genealogy of the tribe of Levi is carried on to the birth of Moses and Aaron. Chronology is made a special aim. Nay, the whole is far more a settlement of chronology than a history properly so called. The date of every single circumstance in the life of Laban, *e.g.* the birth of each of his twelve sons and such matters, is precisely determined. Of course many dates have to be assumed for which Scripture offers no support. A large portion of the chronological statements is obtained by combinations, and in some instances very complicated combinations of actual dates of Holy Scripture. A second fragment (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 29. 1-3) from the history of Moses is chiefly occupied in proving, that Zipporah the wife of Moses was descended from Abraham and Keturah. This fragment is also used in the *Chronicon paschale*, ed. Dindorf, i. 117, and is quoted from Eusebius in the *Chron. Anon.* in Cramer, *Anecdota*, Paris, ii. 256. In a third (Euseb. *Praep.*

evang. ix. 29. 15) the history of the bitter waters (Ex. xv. 22 sqq.) is related. Lastly, the chronological fragment preserved in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 141 gives precise statements concerning the length of time from the carrying away into captivity of the ten tribes and the tribes of Judah and Benjamin to Ptolemy IV. It is just this fragment which gives us also a key to the date of Demetrius. For it is evident that he chose the time of Ptolemy IV. (222–205 B.C.) as a closing point for his calculations, because he himself lived in the reign of that monarch. Hence we obtain also an important standpoint for determining the date of the LXX. For that Demetrius made use of the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch is acknowledged even by Hody, although such acknowledgment is unfavourable to his tendency of pointing out the limited diffusion obtained by the LXX. A glance at the contents of the fragment renders it needless to prove that *its author was a Jew*. It would certainly never have entered the mind of a heathen to take such pains in calculating and completing the Biblical chronology. Nevertheless Josephus took him for one and confounded him with Demetrius Phalereus (*Contra Apion.* i. 23 = Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 42; comp. Müller, *Fragm.* ii. 369^a. Freudenthal, p. 170, note). Among moderns too, e.g. Hody, is found the mistaken notion that he was a heathen. The correct one is however already met with in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* vi. 13. 7, and after him in Hieronymus, *De vir. illustr.* c. 38 (ed. Vallarsi, ii. 879).

Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 141: Δημήτριος δὲ φησιν ἐν τῷ περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλείων τὴν Ἰούδα φυλὴν καὶ Βενιαμὴν καὶ Δεὺτὴ μὴ αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Σεναχρηὶμ, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἀπὸ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας ταύτης εἰς τὴν ἐσχάτην, ἣν ἐποίησατο Ναβουχοδονόσορ ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων, ἔτη ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ὀκτὼ μῆνας ἑξ. ἀφ' οὗ δὲ αἱ φυλαὶ αἱ δέκα ἐν Σαμαρείας αἰχμαλῶται γεγόνασιν ἕως Πτολεμαίου τετάρτου [B.C. 222] ἔτη πεντακόσια ἐβδόμηκοντα τρία μῆνας ἑννέα, ἀφ' οὗ δὲ ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων ἔτη τριακόσια τριάκοντα ὀκτὼ μῆνας τρεῖς. The text of this fragment is in many instances corrupt. 1. It is impossible that Demetrius, with his minute accuracy in scriptural chronology, could have reckoned from 573–338, i.e. 235 years from the carrying away of the ten tribes to the carrying away of the tribes of Benjamin

and Judah, when the interval amounts to about a hundred years less. Hence the number 573 must either be reduced, or that of 338 increased, by one hundred. The latter is undoubtedly correct, since it may be shown, that other ancient chronologists have made the post-exilian period too long (see above on Daniel, p. 54). If Demetrius therefore put down about seventy years too much for this time, there is for just this reason utterly no motive for doing away with this mistake by altering "Ptolemy IV." into "Ptolemy VII." For even in the accurate Demetrius such a mistake concerning the length of the post-exilian period cannot seem surprising, since the scriptural figures here leave him in the lurch. 2. By abbreviation of the text arose the absurdity that an αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Σεναχηρείμ is first denied, and then that this αἰχμαλωσία is computed from. The thought of the original text undoubtedly is, that the tribes of Judah and Benjamin were not made captives, but only laid under contribution, by Sennacherib; and that 120 years elapsed between this pillaging expedition of Sennacherib and the carrying away of Judah and Benjamin. With this computation it best agrees, that from the carrying away of the ten tribes to that of Judah and Benjamin $573 - 438 = 135$ years are reckoned. For the carrying away of the ten tribes by Shalmanezar actually took place about seven or eight years *before* Sennacherib's attack upon Judah (2 Kings xviii. 9-13).

Comp. in general: Vigerus' *Anmerkungen* to his edition of the *Praep. evang.* of Eusebius (1628). Huetius, *Demonstr. evang.* (5th ed. Lips. 1703) Prop. iv. c. 2, § 22, 30. Hody, *De biblior. textibus* (1705), p. 107. Valckenaer, *De Aristobulo*, p. 18. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Rel.-Phil.* ii. 220 sq. Cruice, *De Fl. Josephi fide* (1844), pp. 53-58. C. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iii. 207 sqq. Vaillant, *De historicis qui ante Josephum Judaicas res scripsere* (Paris 1851), pp. 45-52. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 486-488, 575 sq. M. Niebuhr, *Gesch. Assur's und Babel's* (1857), pp. 101-104. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor* (1875), pp. 35-82, 205 sqq., 219 sqq. Mendelssohn, *Anzeige Freudenthal's in der Jenaer, Lit.-Ztg.* 1885, No. 6. Siegfried, *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1875, p. 475. Gutschmid, *Jahrb. für Protestant. Theol.* 1875, p. 744 sqq. Grätz, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenth.* 1877, p. 68 sqq. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Fl. Josephus* (1879), p. 56 sqq.

2. *Eupolemus*.

In place of the dry chronological computations of Demetrius, we find in Eupolemus a chequered narrative which freely handles the scriptural history and further embellishes it with all kinds of additions. Formerly *three* different works of this writer were spoken of: 1. *Περὶ τῶν τῆς Ἀσσυρίας Ἰουδαίων*; 2. *Περὶ τῆς Ἡλίου προφητείας*; and 3. *Περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων* (so Kuhlmeier, p. 3). The first of these falls away, because in the fragment in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 17: *Εὐπόλεμος δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἰουδαίων τῆς Ἀσσυρίας φησὶ πόλιν Βαβυλῶνα πρῶτον μὲν κτισθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν κ.τ.λ.*, the words *τῆς Ἀσσυρίας* certainly refer to what follows (Rauch, p. 21; Freudenthal, p. 207). The title *περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων* is certified by Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 23. 153. To this work also undoubtedly belongs the fragment referring to the history of David and Solomon in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 30–34, which Alexander Polyhistor asserts that he took from a work *περὶ τῆς Ἡλίου προφητείας* (Freudenthal, p. 208). Thus we in truth obtain only one work instead of the supposed three. The first fragment (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 17) probably does not belong to Eupolemus at all (comp. hereon No. 6 below); a second almost verbally identical in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 26, and Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 23. 153, represents Moses as the “first sage,” who transmitted to the Jews the art of alphabetical writing, which was then handed on by the Jews to the Phoenicians, and by the latter to the Hellenes. The *Chronicon paschale*, ed. Dindorf, i. 117, also has this fragment from Eusebius, and Cyrillus Alex. *adv. Julian.* ed. Spanh. p. 231^d, has it from Clement. The long passage in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 30–34 refers to the history of David and Solomon. It commences with a summary of chronology from Moses to David, then briefly relates the chief events of the history of David (Euseb. ix. 30), and then gives a corre-

spondence between Solomon and the kings Uaphres of Egypt and Suron of Phoenicia about assistance in the building of the temple (Euseb. ix. 31-34; comp. Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 130; *Chron. pasch.* ed. Dind. i. 168); and lastly describes in detail the building of the temple (Euseb. ix. 34). The correspondence with Suron = Hiram is taken from 2 Chron. ii. 2, 15, comp. 1 Kings v. 15-25; and that with Uaphres freely imitated from this model. Probably the fragment in Euseb. ix. 39, in which it is related how Jeremiah foretold the captivity, and how his prediction was fulfilled by the conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, also belongs to Eupolemus. The fragment is according to the reading of the best manuscripts anonymous, but may on internal grounds be ascribed to Eupolemus (Freudenthal, p. 208 sq.). A chronological fragment in Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 2114. 1, which computes in a summary manner the time from Adam and Moses respectively to the fifth year of Demetrius, or the twelfth of Ptolemy, gives us information concerning the *date of Eupolemus*. For by this Demetrius we must probably understand (see below) Demetrius I. Soter (162-150 B.C.), and hence Eupolemus would have written in the year 158-157 B.C. or shortly afterwards. He may therefore be, as many have supposed, identical with the Eupolemus mentioned 1 Macc. viii. 17. In this case he would be a Palestinian, which is certainly favoured also by the circumstance, that he seems, besides the translation of the LXX., of which the Book of Chronicles was certainly in his hands, to have made use also of the original Hebrew text (Freudenthal, pp. 108, 119). Concerning his nationality, whether Jew or heathen, opinions are, as also in the case of Demetrius, divided; Josephus, *c. Apion.* i. 23 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 42), esteemed him a heathen, as do also Hody and Kuhlmeier. On the other hand, Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* vi. 13. 7, and Jerome, *De viris illustr.* c. 38, regard him as a Jew. And this, as Freudenthal has recently shown, is undoubtedly correct (pp. 83-85).

Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 141: "Ἐτι δὲ καὶ Εὐπόλεμος ἐν τῇ ὁμοίᾳ πραγματείᾳ τὰ πάντα ἔτη φησὶν ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ ἄχρι τοῦ πέμπτου ἔτους Δημητρίου βασιλείας, Πτολεμαίου τὸ δωδέκατον βασιλεύοντος Αἰγύπτου, συνάγεσθαι ἔτη εἰκοθ'. ἀφ' οὗ δὲ χρόνου ἐξήγαγε Μωυσῆς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐπὶ τὴν προειρημένην προθεσμίαν συνάγεσθαι ἔτη διςχίλια πεντακόσια ὀγδοήκοντα. [ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ χρόνου τούτου ἄχρι τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ὑπάτων Γαίου Δομετιανοῦ Κασσιανοῦ συναθροίζεται ἔτη ἑκατὸν εἰκοσι]. In this fragment also the text is defective. Above all, it is certain that the number 2580 must be corrected to 1580, since Eupolemus could not have reckoned 2580 years from Moses to his own time. Then the synchronism of the fifth year of Demetrius with the twelfth of Ptolemy causes difficulties. For no twelfth year of any Ptolemy coincides with the fifth year of Demetrius II. (= 142–141 B.C.). The twelfth year indeed of Ptolemy VII. (= 159–158) concurs with the fifth year of Demetrius I. (= 158–157 B.C.). But Ptolemy VII. Physcon was at that time only ruler of Cyrenaica. He reigned in Egypt contemporaneously with his brother Ptolemy VI. Philometor, who however began his reign four years previously. We must therefore either regard, with Gutschmid, the whole statement concerning Ptolemy as a gloss or, which is more simple, alter the number. However this may be, the supposition that Demetrius I. Soter is intended is especially favoured by the circumstance, that at all events such was the view of Clemens Alex. For he reckons from the fifth year of Demetrius to the consulship of Cn. Domitius Calvinus and C. Asinius Pollio (these names being certainly hidden under the corrupted words Γαίου Δομετιανοῦ Κασσιανῶ, i.e. to the year 40 B.C. in which Herod was named king (Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 14. 5) 120 years, which of necessity reach back to Demetrius I., even if the reckoning is not quite accurate. Gutschmid has best restored the closing words by the complement Γναίου Δομετίου καὶ Ἀσινίου ὑπὸ Κασσιανῶ συναθροίζεται. Cassianus is mentioned as a chronologist by Clem. *Strom.* i. 21. 101.

Comp. in general: Huetius, *Demonstr. evang. Prop.* iv. c. ii. § 29. Hody, *De biblior. textib.* p. 106. Valckenaer, *De Aristobulo*, pp. 18, 24. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung*, ii. 221 sq. Kuhlmeier, *Eupolemi fragmenta prolegomenis et commentario instructa*, Berol. 1840. Rauch, *De Alex. Polyh.* pp. 20–22. Cruice, *De Fl. Jos. fide*, pp. 58–61. C. Müller, *Fragm. hist. gr.* iii. 207 sqq. Vailant, *De historicis*, etc., pp. 52–59. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 481–483, 572–574. M. Niebuhr, *Gesch. Assur's*, pp. 353–356. Cobet in *Δόγιος Ἐρμῆς ἐκδ. ὑπὸ Κόντου*, vol. i. (Leyden 1866) p. 168 sq. Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.* i. 76, vii. 91, 92. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyh.* pp. 82 sqq., 105–130, 208 sqq., 225 sqq. Siegfried, *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1875,

p. 476 sqq. Gutschmid, *Jahrbh. f. prot. Theol.* 1875, p. 749 sqq. Grätz, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenth.* 1877, p. 61 sqq. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Fl. Josephus* (1879), p. 58 sqq.

3. Artapanus.

In his work *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* Artapanus is still farther removed than Eupolemus from the sober and unadorned style of Demetrius. The sacred history is quite methodically embellished, or to speak more correctly remodelled, by fantastic and tasteless additions — and this recasting is throughout in the interest of the tendency to a glorification of the Jewish people. One chief aim is directed towards proving, that the Egyptians were indebted to the Jews for all useful knowledge and institutions. Thus the very first fragment (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 18) relates that Abraham, when he journeyed into Egypt, instructed the king, Pharethothes, in astrology. A second (Euseb. ix. 23) narrates how Joseph, when raised by the king to be the chief governor of the country, provided for the better cultivation of the land. And finally, the long article concerning Moses (Euseb. ix. 27) gives detailed information of his being the real founder of all the culture and even of the worship of the gods in Egypt. For he it was whom the Greeks call Musaeus, the instructor of Orpheus, the author of a multitude of useful inventions and attainments, of navigation, architecture, military science, and philosophy. He also divided the country into thirty-six provinces, and commanded each province to worship God; he also instructed the priests in hieroglyphics. He introduced order into State affairs. Hence he was beloved by the Egyptians, who called him Hermas, *διὰ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων ἐρμηνείαν*. King Chenephres however sought, out of envy, to get rid of him. But none of the means he used succeeded. When Chenephres was dead, Moses received commandment from God to deliver His people from Egyptian bondage. The history of the exodus and of all that preceded

it, especially of the miracles by which the permission to depart was extorted, is then related at length and in accordance with the Scripture narrative, but at the same time with many additions and embellishments. Single traits from this history are related, with express appeal to Artapanus, in Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 23. 154, in *Chron. pasch.* ed. Dindorf, i. 117, and in the *Chron. anonym.* in Cramer, *Anecdota*, Paris, ii. 176. Traces of the employment of this work may be pointed out especially in Josephus (see Freudenthal, pp. 169–171). The more plainly its Jewish authorship is manifested by the tendency of the whole work, the more strange does it appear, that Moses and the patriarchs should be exhibited as founders of the Egyptian worships. Jacob and his sons are represented as founding the sanctuaries at Athos and Heliopolis (23. 4). Moses directs each province to honour God (τὸν Θεὸν σεφθήσεσθαι); he prescribes the consecration of the Ibis (27. 9) and of Apis (27. 12). In a word, the religion of Egypt is referred to Jewish authority. This fact has been explained by Freudenthal by the surely incorrect notion, that the author was indeed a Jew, but wanted to pass for a heathen, and indeed for an Egyptian priest (pp. 149 sq., 152 sq.). For nowhere does such an attempt come plainly forward. And with such a tendency, an entirely unknown name such as Artapanus would certainly never have been chosen as a shield. Nor does it at all explain the phenomena. For if the work had appeared under a heathen mask, we should surely expect, that it would have energetically denounced in the name of this acknowledged authority the abomination of idol-worship, as is actually done, *e.g.* in the case of the Sibyllist (iii. 20), and of pseudo-Aristeas (pp. 38, 14 sq., ed. Mor. Schmidt). Thus, under all circumstances, the strange fact remains, that a Jewish author has represented Moses as the founder of Egyptian rites. But however strange this may appear, it is explained by the tendency of the whole. Moses was the introducer of all culture, even of religious culture. This and nothing else is the meaning. Besides, it

must be considered, that the heathen worship is in reality represented in a tolerably innocent light. For the sacred animals are not so much worshipped, as on the contrary "consecrated" for their utility— $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\Theta\epsilon\hat{\omega}$, as we cannot but conclude. But even thus, we certainly have still to do with a Jewish author, who cared more for the honour of the Jewish name, than for the purity of divine worship. Perhaps too an apologetic purpose co-operated in causing the Jews, who were decried as despisers of the gods, to figure as founders of religious worship. Considering the marked prominence of Egyptian references, there needs no other proof that the author was an Egyptian. With regard to date, it can only be affirmed with certainty of him and of those who follow, that they were predecessors of Alexander Polyhistor.

Comp. in general: Huetius, *Demonstr. evang.* Prop. iv. c. ii. § 62. Valckenaer, *De Aristobulo*, p. 26. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung*, ii. 200–203. Rauch, *De Alexandro Polyhistoro*, p. 22 sq. C. Müller, *Fragm.* iii. 207 sqq. Vaillant, *De historicis* etc., pp. 74–83. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 483–486, 574. Cobet in the $\Delta\acute{\omicron}\gamma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ 'Ερμῆς , i. 170, 171. Ewald, ii. 129. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyh.* pp. 143–174, 215 sqq., 231 sqq. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Josephus*, p. 60 sqq.

4. *Aristeas.*

A fragment from the work of one otherwise unknown, Aristeas $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$ 'Ιουδαίων , in which the history of Job is briefly related in accordance with the Bible, is given in Euseb. *Praep. ev.* ix. 25. The history itself presents nothing worthy of remark, but the personal accounts both of Job and his friends are supplemented on the ground of other scriptural material. Thus it is said of Job, that he was formerly called *Jobab*, 'Ιώβ being evidently identical with 'Ιωβάβ , Gen. xxxvi. 33. Upon the ground of this identification Job is then made a descendant of Esau, for Jobab was a son of Serach (Gen. xxxvi. 33), and the latter a grandson of Esau (Gen. xxxvi. 10, 13). According indeed to the extract of

Alexander Polyhistor, Aristeas is said to have related that Esau himself "married Bassara and begot Job of her" (τὸν Ἦσαν γήμαντα Βασσάραν ἐν Ἐδὼμ γεννήσαι Ἰώβ). Most probably however this rests upon an inaccurate reference of Alexander Polyhistor; for Aristeas, who was quoting from the Bible, must certainly have called Jobab not the son, but correctly the great-grandson of Esau. From Gen. xxxvi. 33 is also derived the name Bassara as the mother of Job (Ἰωβὰβ υἱὸς Ζαρὰ ἐκ Βοσόρρας, where indeed Bosra is in reality not the mother, but the native place of Jobab). Our author already used the LXX. translation of the Book of Job. It is moreover remarkable, that in the supplement to Job in the Septuagint the personal accounts of Job are compiled exactly after the manner of Aristeas. Freudenthal thinks it certain that this supplement was derived from Aristeas.

Comp. in general: C. Müller, *Fragm.* iii. 207 sqq. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 488 sqq., 577-579. Ewald, vii. 92. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyhistor*, pp. 136-143, 231.

5. Cleodemus or Malchus.

The work of a certain Cleodemus or Malchus, of which unfortunately only a short notice is preserved, seems to have presented a classic example of that intermixture of native (Oriental) and Greek traditions, which was popular throughout the region of Hellenism. The notice in question is communicated by Alexander Polyhistor, but is taken by Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* ix. 20, not directly from the latter, but from Josephus, *Antt.* i. 15, who on his part quotes literally from Alexander. The author is here called Κλεόδημος ὁ προφήτης ὁ καὶ Μάλχος, ὁ ἱστορῶν τὰ περὶ Ἰουδαίων καθὼς καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἱστόρησεν ὁ νομοθέτης αὐτῶν. Both the Semitic name Malchus and the contents of the work prove, that the author was no Greek, but either a Jew or a Samaritan. Freudenthal prefers the latter view chiefly on account of the intermixture of Greek and Jewish traditions. But about 200-100 B.C. this is

quite as possible in a Jew as in a Samaritan. In the work of this Malchus it is related, that Abraham had three sons by Keturah, Ἀφέραν, Ἀσουρείμ, Ἰάφραν, from whom the Assyrians, the town of Aphra and the land of Africa derive their names. The orthography of the names (which I have given according to Freudenthal) vacillates considerably. Hence אֲשֻׁרִים, אֵפֶרָה and עֶפֶר, Gen. xxv. 3, 4, are evidently identical with them. But while in Gen. xxv. Arab tribes are intended, our author derives from them entirely different nations, which were known to him. He then further relates, that the three sons of Abraham departed with Heracles to Libya and Antaeus, that Heracles married the daughter of Aphra, and of her begat Diodorus, whose son again was Sophonas (or Sophax), from whom the Sophaki derive their name. These last traditions are also found in the Libyan (or Roman?) history of King Juba (Plutarch. Sertor. c. ix., also in Müller, *Fragm. hist. gr.* iii. 471); only that the genealogical relation of Diodorus and Sophax is reversed: Heracles begets Sophax of Tinge, the widow of Antaeus, and Diodorus is the son of Sophax.

Comp. in general: C. Müller, *Fragm.* iii. 207 sqq. Vaillant, *De historicis*, etc., pp. 72–74. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 489, 575. Ewald, vii. 91. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyh.* pp. 130–136, 215, 230. Siegfried, *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1875, p. 476 sq.

6. An anonymous Writer.

Among the extracts of Alexander Polyhistor are found, Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 17 and 18, two, which to judge by their contents are evidently identical, although the one is much shorter than the other. The longer (Euseb. ix. 17) is given as an extract from Eupolemus, who relates that Abraham descended in the [thir]teenth generation from the race of giants, who after the deluge built the tower of Babel, that he himself emigrated from Chaldaea to Phoenicia and taught the Phoenicians τροπὰς ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα.

He also proved of assistance to them in war. He then departed by reason of a famine to Egypt, where he lived with the priests in Heliopolis and taught them much, instructing them in τὴν ἀστρολογίαν καὶ τὰ λοιπά. The real discoverer however of astrology was Enoch, who received it from the angels and imparted it to men. We are told the same virtually, but more briefly, in the second extract, Euseb. ix. 18, which Alexander Polyhistor derived from *an anonymous work* (ἐν δὲ ἀδεσπότοις εὔρομεν). If this parallel narrative is itself striking, it must also be added, that the longer extract can scarcely be from Eupolemus. Eupolemus was a Jew, but in the extract Gerizim is explained by ὄρος ἰψίστου. Also according to Eupolemus Moses was the first sage (Euseb. ix. 26), while in the extract Abraham is already glorified as the father of all science. Hence the supposition of Freudenthal, that the original of both extracts was one and the same, viz. *the anonymous work of a Samaritan*, and that the longer extract of Alexander has been ascribed by an oversight to Eupolemus, is one which commends itself. In this work also, as remains to be mentioned, Greek traditions and Scripture history are again blended.

Comp. in general: C. Müller, *Fragm.* iii. 207 sqq. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyh.* pp. 82-103, 207 sq., 223 sqq. Siegfried, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1875, p. 476.

7. Jason of Cyrene and the second Book of Maccabees.

The authors from whom extracts were made by Alexander Polyhistor compiled chiefly from the older Scripture history. The work of Jason of Cyrene, on which our second Book of Maccabees is based, is an example of the treatment of those important epochs of later Jewish history, in which they had themselves lived, by Hellenistic Jews. For this book is, as the author himself informs us, only an abridgment (ἐπιτομή, 2 Macc. ii. 26, 28) from the larger work of a certain Jason of Cyrene (2 Macc. ii. 23). The original work comprised five

volumes, which are in our second Book of Maccabees condensed into one (2 Macc. ii. 23). Thus the contents of the former seem to have been parallel with those of the latter. The abridgment handed down to us tells first of an unsuccessful attack upon the treasury of the temple, undertaken in the time of Seleucus IV. (B.C. 175) by his minister Heliodorus; it then relates the religious persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes and the apostasy of a portion of the Jews; and lastly recounts the Maccabaeen rising and its progress down to the decisive victory of Judas over Nicanor (160 B.C.). Thus the book comprises a period of not much more than fifteen years, 175-160 B.C. The events related are for the most part the same as in the first Book of the Maccabees. But the narrative differs in many particulars, and in some parts even in the order of the events, from the account in the first book. The differences are of such a kind that an acquaintance with that book can hardly be assumed on the part of our author (Hitzig, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. 415, holds the opposite view). At the same time there can be no doubt, that on the whole, the simple narrative of 1 Macc., based as it is on good native sources, deserves the preference over the rhetorical narrative of the second. On the other hand the latter offers a copiousness of independent detail, especially in the preliminary history of the Maccabaeen rising, the historical truth of which there are no grounds for doubting. The view must therefore be accepted, that contemporary sources of information were at the disposal also of Jason of Cyrene, but that these were probably not in writing, but only the oral accounts of contemporaries, who narrated from memory the events of those fifteen years. If such narratives reached Jason not directly, but through a series of intermediaries, this would explain both the copiousness and the inaccuracy of the details.

If the view that Jason of Cyrene derived the history he relates from the lips of contemporaries is correct, he must have written not long after 160 B.C. At all events, unless we are willing to allow for the use of written documents also, we must

not make the interval between the events and the date of the author too long, as otherwise an acquaintance with such numerous and yet relatively correct particulars would be no longer possible. Nor does the mythical character of many of the narratives (*e.g.* the martyrdom of Eleazar and the seven brethren, 2 Macc. vi.—vii.) tend against the view of so early an origin. For a period of a few decades—especially at a distance from the scene of the events—is more than sufficient for the formation of such myths. The unhistorical notice, xv. 37, that after the victory over Nicanor Jerusalem remained in the hands of the Hebrews, can indeed only have been written by one at a great distance from the events. But on the other hand this scarcely affects Jason but his epitomizer. Why the narrative breaks off at the victory over Nicanor is somewhat enigmatical. Perhaps this ending was not contemplated by Jason.

With respect to the date of the epitomizer it can only be said, that he is certainly *more ancient than Philo*, who seems to have been acquainted with this book. Both the original work and the epitome were without doubt *originally written in Greek*. For it is very characteristically distinguished by its rhetorical Greek style from the annalistic Hebrew style of the first Book of Maccabees. The second book is very unlike the first in another respect also; it aims directly at edification by the narrative of the heroic faith of the Maccabees, and of the marvellous events by which God preserved the continuance of the Jewish religion and worship.

The two letters, which are now placed before this book (2 Macc. i.—ii. 18), stand in no connection with it. They are letters of the Palestinian to the Egyptian Jews, in which the latter are summoned to the feast of the Dedication. They are evidently two originally independent pieces of writing, afterwards combined by a later hand, but not that of the epitomizer, with this second Book of Maccabees. Their purpose is to influence the Egyptian Jews with respect to the feast of the Dedication.

In Philo's work, *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 13 (Mang. ii. 459), is described the manner in which many tyrants have persecuted the pious and virtuous. The several features of this description so greatly recall that of Antiochus Epiphanes in the second Book of Maccabees, that an acquaintance with this book on the part of Philo can scarcely be doubted; comp. Lucius, *Der Essenismus* (1881), pp. 36–39. Josephus has indeed a few points in common with this book, which are absent from 1 Macc. (see Grimm, *Exeget. Handb. zu 2 Macc.* p. 13). It is nevertheless very improbable that he was acquainted with the second Book of Maccabees (see Grimm, p. 20). On the other hand the philosophical exhortation, known as the fourth Book of Maccabees, is entirely based upon it.

Christian testimony begins with Heb. xi. 35; for ἐτυμπανίσθησαν evidently refers to 2 Macc. vi. 19, 28 (ἐπὶ τὸ τύμπανον προσήγε, ἐπὶ τὸ τύμπανον εὐθέως ἦλθε), while other allusions in Heb. xi. 35 sq. recall 2 Macc. vi.–vii. Comp. Bleek, *Stud. und Kritik*, 1853, p. 339, and Bleek's *Commentary* on Heb. xi. 35. The oldest quotation is Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 97: 'Ἀριστοβούλῳ . . . οὗ μέμνηται ὁ συνταξάμενος τὴν τῶν Μακκαβαϊκῶν ἐπιτομὴν (comp. 2 Macc. i. 10). Hippolytus in his work, *de Christo et Antichristo*, c. 49 (Lagarde, p. 25), refers to this book in the words: καὶ ταῦτα μὲν . . . σεσήμενται ἐν τοῖς Μακκαβαϊκοῖς.

Origen appeals in many passages to this book in proof of important doctrines: 1. Of the doctrine of creation *ex nihilo* to 2 Macc. vii. 28 (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὁ Θεός): *Comment. in Joann.* vol. i. c. 18 (Lommatzsch, i. 37); *de principiis*, ii. 1. 5 (Lommatzsch, xxi. 142). 2. Of the doctrine of the intercession of saints to 2 Macc. xv. 14 (ὁ πολλὰ προσευχόμενος περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως Ἰερουσάλαμ): *Comment. in Joann.* vol. xiii. c. 57 (Lommatzsch, ii. 120); *in Cant. Cant.* lib. iii. (Lommatzsch, xv. 26); *de oratione*, c. 11 (Lommatzsch, xvii. 125). 3. He also makes special and very full mention of the history of Eleazar and the seven Maccabaeen brothers (2 Macc. vi. 18–vii. *fin.*) as glorious examples of dauntless martyrdom in the *Exhortatio ad martyrium*, c. 22–27 (Lommatzsch, xx. 261–268); comp. also *Comment. in epist. ad Rom.* lib. iv. c. 10 (Lommatzsch, vi. 305). 4. Other quotations in Origen: *fragm. in Exod.* (Lommatzsch, viii. 302); *contra Cels.* viii. 46, *fin.* (Lommatzsch, xx. 176).

Cyprian also quotes the history of the Maccabaeen martyrs, 2 Macc. vi.–vii. (*ad Fortunatum*, c. 11, and *Testim.* iii. 17). The Fathers in general have delighted in treating of these Maccabaeen martyrs (often with the use of the so-called fourth Book of Maccabees); nay, they were at last transplanted among Christian saints. For material bearing on this, see Wetstein's

notes on Origen, *Echort. ad martyr.* c. 23 (Lommatzsch, xx. 262), and the *Vitae Sanctorum* (Lipomannus, Surius, Bollandist., Nilles' *Kalendarium manuale*, 1879 to August 1); some also in Freudenthal, *Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift über die Herrschaft der Vernunft* (1869), p. 29 sqq. Creuzer, *Stud. und Krit.* 1853, p. 85 sq. Bähr, *Die christlichen Dichter und Geschichtschreiber Roms* (2nd ed. 1872), p. 50 sqq.

Its title as the second Book of the Maccabees is first found in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 9, *fin.*: 'Αριστόβουλος . . . οὗτος δ' αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος, οὗ καὶ ἡ δευτέρα τῶν Μακκαβαίων ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς βίβλου μνημονεύει. Hieronymus, *Prolog. galeatus* to the Books of Samuel (Vallarsi, ix. 459): *Machabaeorum primum librum Hebraicum reperi. Secundus Graecus est, quod ex ipsa quoque φράσει probari potest.*

With respect to *manuscripts, editions and ancient translations*, what was said above, p. 10, in the case of the first Book of Maccabees, applies in most instances to the second. We need only remark: (1) that the second Book of Maccabees is not contained in the cod. Sinaiticus, and (2) that besides the old Latin translation, which has passed into the Vulgate (and which alone Sabatier, *Biblior. sacror. Lat. versiones antiquae*, vol. ii., knows), there is another in a cod. Ambrosianus from which Peyron has published it (*Ciceronis orationum pro Scauro, pro Tullio et in Clodium fragmenta inedita*, 1824, p. 73 sqq.); the edition of the same text promised for Ceriani's *Monumenta sacra et prof.* vol. i. fasc. 3, has, as far as I know, not yet made its appearance.

The *exegetical and critical literature* also of this book is almost entirely the same as that of the first Book of Maccabees (see above, p. 11 sq.). In the *Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen* (Leipzig 1857) the fourth part compiled by Grimm treats of the second, third and fourth Books of the Maccabees. We mention besides: [H. Eberh. Glo. Paulus], "Ueber das zweyte Buch der Maccabäer" (Eichhorn's *Allg. Biblioth. der bibl. Literatur*, vol. i. 1787, pp. 233-241). Bertheau, *De secundo libro Maccabaeorum*, Gotting. 1829. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, ii. 443-456. Patrizzi, *De consensu utriusque libri Machabaeorum*, Romae 1856. Cigoi, *Historischchronologische Schwierigkeiten im zweiten Makkabäerbuche*, Klagenfurt 1868. Kasten, *Der historische Werth des zweiten Buches der Makkabäer*, Stolp 1879 (Gymnasialprogr.).

On the two letters at the beginning of the book see (besides the above-named literature): Valckenaer, *De Aristobulo*, pp. 38-44. Schlünkes, *Epistolae quae secundo Macc. libro i. 1-9, legitur explicatio*, Colon. 1844. The same, *Difficiliorum locorum epistolae quae 2 Macc. i. 10-ii. 18, legitur explicatio*, Colon. 1847. Grätz, "Das Sendschreiben der Palästinenser an die ägyptisch-

judäischen Gemeinden wegen der Feier der Tempelweihe" (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1877, pp. 1-16, 49-60).

8. *The Third Book of Maccabees.*

The so-called third Book of Maccabees may here be mentioned along with the second, as having at least the form of an historical narrative of a supposed episode of later Jewish history. In truth it is a tolerably insipid piece of fiction founded at most on an entirely unascertainable historical fact. It relates how Ptolemy IV. Philopator, after his victory over Antiochus the Great at Raphia, came to Jerusalem and entertained the desire of entering also the interior of the temple. As he was not to be turned from his purpose by any representations, the Jews in their distress cried to God, who heard their prayer and struck Ptolemy, so that he fell stunned to the ground (i.-ii. 24). Ptolemy exasperated returned to Egypt and meditated revenge. He deprived the Alexandrian Jews of their civic rights, and commanded that all the Jews in Egypt, together with their wives and children, should be brought in chains to Alexandria, where they were confined in the racecourse. Their number was so great, that the clerks, who were to write down the names of each, had not, after forty days' labour, come to the end, and were obliged to leave off for want of writing materials (ii. 25-iv. *fin.*). Ptolemy now commanded that five hundred elephants should be intoxicated by wine and incense and incited against the people in the racecourse. When all preparations had been made the execution was delayed till the next day, because the king had slept till the time for his chief meal. On the second day too nothing was done, because the king had, through the dispensation of God, suddenly forgotten everything, and was very angry to find that hostile designs were entertained against his faithful servants the Jews. On the same day however he repeated at his repast the former

order for the extirpation of the Jews. When then on the third day matters at last seemed getting serious, and the king was already approaching the racecourse with his troops, two angels appeared from heaven at the prayer of the Jews and paralysed the troops of the king with terror. The elephants then rushed upon the troops of the king, trampled on and destroyed them (v.-vi. 21). The king was now much irritated against his counsellors and commanded the Jews to be liberated from their chains, nay, to be entertained for seven days at his expense. Then they celebrated their deliverance with feasting and rejoicing, and resolved to keep these days as festivals for ever. And the king issued a letter of protection in favour of the Jews to all governors in the provinces, and gave the Jews permission to put to death such of their fellow-countrymen as had apostatized from the faith. They made abundant use of this permission and returned joyfully home (vi. 22-vii. *fin.*).

This narrative is not only almost throughout a mere fiction, but it belongs, among productions of the kind, to those of the weakest sort. The author evidently revels in keeping up psychological impossibilities. The style also corresponds, being bombastic and involved. The only foundation for the author's fiction seems to have been an old legend which we still read in Josephus. For he relates (*contra Apion.* ii. 5) that Ptolemy VII. Physcon cast the Jews of Alexandria, who as adherents of Cleopatra were his political opponents, to intoxicated elephants, who however turned instead against the friends of the king, whereupon the king gave up his purpose and the Jews of Alexandria celebrated the day in remembrance of the event. According to this account the celebration of this festival, which is also mentioned in the third Book of Maccabees (vi. 36), seems at all events to be historical. And some unascertained fact may certainly be the foundation of the legend, the older form of which seems to have been in the hands of Josephus, since all is in his account simpler and more psychologically

comprehensible, and he was evidently unacquainted with the third Book of Maccabees. When then the latter refers the history to Ptolemy IV. instead of VII., this is already a divergence from the older legend, and still more so are the other additions with which the author has enriched his narrative.

As to the *date of the author*, the utmost that can be ventured is a conjecture. The contents and tendency of the book seem to presuppose a persecution of the Alexandrian Jews, on account of which the author desires to comfort and encourage his co-religionists. This leads our thoughts to *the time of Caligula*, when such a persecution on a large scale took place for the first time. Hence Ewald, Hausrath, Reuss and others place the composition of the book in his reign. But then it would be strange, that the author does not make Ptolemy lay claim to divine honours, which was the chief stumbling-block in the case of Caligula. On the whole we should expect in it more special references to events under Caligula. Hence we can but approve of Grimm's reservation, though he has every inclination to agree with Ewald's hypothesis (*Exeget. Handb.* p. 218 sq.). In general, we may say, that the book originated at the earliest in the first century before Christ, at the latest in the first century after Christ; the former, because the author already knows the Greek additions to Daniel (vi. 6); the latter, because it would otherwise have found no acceptance with the Christian Church.

The oldest Christian testimony is the *Canones apost.* (in Cotelier, *Patr. apost.* 2nd ed. i. 453) canon 76 (*al.* 85): Μακκαβαίων τρία. The stichometry of Nicephorus also reckons: Μακκαβαϊκά γ' (in Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 119). In the *Synopsis Athanasii* stands instead Μακκαβαϊκά βιβλία δ', Πτολεμαϊκά (Credner, p. 144), where, according to Credner's conjecture, καί is perhaps to be read instead of the number δ', so that our third Book of Maccabees would have to be understood by Πτολεμαϊκά. For other testimony, see Eichhorn, *Einkl. in die apokr. Schriften des A. T.* p. 288 sq. Grimm, *Handb.* p. 221 sq. *The book seems never to have been known in*

the *Latin Church*, on which account it is absent from the Vulgate. On the other hand, it found approbation in the *Syrian Church*, as the existing old Syriac translation proves. The name "Book of Maccabees" has been very inaptly given to the book, merely because here also a persecution of Jews faithful to their religion is the subject.

The book is as a rule found in the *manuscripts* of the Septuagint, so especially in the cod. Alexandrinus. Hence it is also found in most *editions* of the Septuagint and in the separate editions of the Greek apocryphal books (see above, p. 10 sq.). Of ancient versions the old Syriac need only be mentioned here (see above, p. 11).

For the exegetical aids in general, see above, p. 11. Commentary: Grimm, "Das zweite, dritte und vierte Buch der Maccabäer" (*Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des A.T.'s*, Part 4), Leipzig 1857. Investigations: Eichhorn, *Einkl. in die apokryphischen Schriften des A.T.'s*, pp. 278–290. Bertholdt, *Einkl. in sammtliche kanon. und apokr. Schriften des A. u. N. T.* vol. iii. pp. 1082–1091. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 611–614. De Wette-Schrader, *Einkl. in das A.T.'s*, p. 572 sq. Keil, *Einkl. in das A.T.* 3rd ed. p. 720 sq. Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. ii. 262–265. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments*, § 574.

9. Philo's Historical Works.

Philo, the philosopher, must also be named here as a writer of works on Jewish history. Indeed he has left us narratives not only from the *more ancient* history, but also from that of *his own times*.

1. With respect to the former a large work, which has been preserved almost entire, viz. a comprehensive *delineation of the Mosaic legislation*, must first be mentioned. It is not indeed an historical narrative properly so called, but a systematic statement; still it is one so made, that Philo attempts therein to give a survey of the legislative labours of Moses himself, i.e. of the virtual contents of the Pentateuch. That he does not do this without being essentially influenced by his own philosophical views is a thing self-evident. But still his purpose is simply to give, in an objective historical manner, a survey of the Mosaic legislation. The several

parts of this work have come down to us in the manuscripts and editions under special titles, as though they were separate books. It will be shown below, § 34, that the plan of the whole work is as follows: (a) The first book refers to the *creation of the world*. For Moses treated of this in the beginning of his work, to make it plain that his legislation was according to the will of nature. (b) The following books treat of the lives of Enos, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph, but so that the first three are only briefly treated in the introduction to the life of Abraham, while the last four have each a separate book devoted to them. The lives of Abraham and Joseph have been preserved. The histories of all these individuals is related, because by their lives they exhibit the universal types of morality, "the living unwritten laws." (c) Next follows *the legislation proper, the ten chief commandments*, first in one book and then in four books, *the special laws* arranged according to the rubrics of the ten commandments (particulars, § 34). Thus a survey is really taken of the actual contents of the Pentateuch. The tendency of the entire work is everywhere to hold up the Jewish law as the wisest and most humane. The ritual and ceremonial laws are not passed by; but Philo always knows how to realize their rational side, so that he who perfectly observes them is not only the best, but also the most cultured man, the true philosopher. This also makes it clear that the work, if not solely, was chiefly intended for *non-Jewish readers*. The educated of all nations were to be brought by it to the perception, that the Jewish was the most perfect law, the law by which men were best trained to be good citizens and true philosophers.

In a separate work, which does not, as has been usually supposed, belong to this collective work, Philo has also written *a life of Moses* himself. In this also the manner and object are the same as in the systematic work. Moses is described as the greatest and wisest of lawgivers, and as raised above all others by mighty deeds and miraculous experiences.

2. Philo also described in a lengthy work the most important and the saddest episode of the Jewish history of his times, *the persecutions of the Jews under Caligula*. By way of introduction he spoke also in it of the persecutions brought about by Sejanus in the reign of Tiberius. The work, according to Eusebius, contained five books. The two which have come down to us (*in Flaccum* and *de legatione ad Cajum*) probably formed the third and fourth (particulars, § 34). Philo having been an eye-witness of the events he narrates, nay, as leader of a Jewish embassy to Caligula, a prominent sharer in them, his work is a first-class authority for the history of this period.

10. *Josephus*.

The best known historian of Jewish affairs in the Greek language is the Palestinian Josephus, properly Joseph, the son of Matthias, a priest of Jerusalem. Of his two chief works one is, the *Ἰουδαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία*, a *comprehensive delineation of the entire Jewish history* from the beginning to his own times. It is the most extensive work on Jewish history in the Greek language with which we are acquainted, and has on that account so retained the lasting favour of Jewish, heathen and Christian readers, as to have been preserved entire in numerous manuscripts (particulars, see above, Div. i. vol. i. § 3). Notwithstanding its great difference from the philosophizing delineation of Philo, its tendency is similar. For it is the purpose of Josephus, not only to instruct his heathen readers, for whom it was in the first instance intended, in the history of his people, but also to inspire them with respect for the Jewish nation, both as having a history of hoar antiquity, and a long series of celebrities both in peace and war to point to, and as able to bear comparison in respect of laws and institutions with any nation (comp. especially *Antt.* xvi. 6. 8). The other chief work of Josephus, the *History of the Jewish War from A.D. 66–73*, gives the history more for its own sake. The events of these

years are in themselves so important, that they seemed worthy of a detailed description. Perhaps it was written by command of Vespasian, from whom Josephus received an annual salary (*Vita*, 76), and to whom the work was delivered as soon as it was completed (*contra Apion*. i. 9; *Vita*, 65). If a tendency to boasting is detected in it, this refers rather to the individual Josephus and the Romans than to the Jewish nation.

11. *Justus of Tiberias.*

Justus of Tiberias, a contemporary and fellow-countryman of Josephus, was also his fellow-labourer. He too devoted himself to authorship after the destruction of his nation, but having been less successful therein than Josephus, his works were less read, and have therefore been lost. He has this in common with Josephus, that he too treated both of Jewish history as a whole and of the events of his own times, each in one work. His *History of the Jewish Kings*, from Moses to Agrippa II., was, according to the statement of Photius, who was still acquainted with it (*Biblioth. Cod.* 33), "very brief in expression, and passed over much that was necessary." As it was made use of by Julius Africanus in his *Chronicle*, it may well be supposed that its form was that of a chronicle, in which stress was chiefly laid upon the settling of the chronology.

In another work Justus seems to have presented, whether wholly or partly, the *History of the Jewish War* in a manner by which Josephus felt himself compromised, since in his *Vita* he enters into a very warm controversy against Justus.

IV. EPIC POETRY AND THE DRAMA.

1. *Philo the Epic Poet.*

The appropriation of Greek forms of literature on the part of the Hellenistic Jews did not stop at prose. *Even the epic*

and dramatic poetry of the Greeks were transplanted to the soil of *Hellenistic Judaism*, the sacred history being sung under the form of the Greek Epos, nay, represented in the form of the Greek drama. For what is still preserved of this remarkable literature, we are indebted to the extracts of Alexander Polyhistor, which have been inserted by Eusebius in his *Praeparatio evangelica* (see above, p. 197 sqq.).

Three small fragments from a Greek poem "On Jerusalem" (*Περὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα*) by a certain Philo are given by Eusebius (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 20, 24, 37). The subject of the first is *Abraham*, of the second *Joseph*, of the third the springs and water-pipes of Jerusalem, the abundance of which is extolled. The first and third are taken from the first book of the work quoted (ix. 20: *Φίλων ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Περὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα*; ix. 37: *Φίλων ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Ἱεροσολύμων . . . ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ*); the second professedly from the fourteenth (ix. 24: *Φίλων ἐν τῇ ἰδ' τῶν Περὶ Ἱεροσόλυμα*). But that Philo should have used fourteen books to get as far as the history of Joseph is too improbable. Hence we may suppose with Freudenthal, that possibly we must read *ἐν τῇ ἰδ'* instead of *ἐν τῇ δ'*. The language of Philo is that of the Greek epic, but his hexameters are written with a true contempt of Greek prosody, and the diction is pompous, and so involved as to be unintelligible.

The Philo mentioned by Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 141, and by Josephus, *contra Apion.* i. 23 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 42), and whom Josephus distinguishes from the more recent philosopher by calling him Philo the elder (*Φίλων ὁ πρεσβύτερος*), is certainly identical with our epic writer. According to the notice of him in Clemens Alexandrinus, we might indeed suppose, that some prose writer, who treated Jewish history in like manner as Demetrius and Eupolemus do, was spoken of (*Strom.* i. 21. 141: *Φίλων δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνέγραψε τοὺς βασιλεῖς τοὺς Ἰουδαίων διαφώνως τῷ Δημητρίῳ*). Josephus took him for a heathen, for he adduces him, together with Demetrius and Eupolemus, as a proof, that many

heathen authors also had a tolerably accurate acquaintance with Jewish history. But the circumstance that both Clemens and Josephus, in the passages cited, place this Philo *in the same series* as Demetrius and Eupolemus (both have the order Demetrius, Philo, Eupolemus), proves, that both were drawing from the same source, and this can be no other than Alexander Polyhistor. Since then no other Philo than the epic writer occurs in the copious contributions from Alexander Polyhistor in Eusebius, there is no doubt that Clemens and Josephus mean the same. Consequently Philo, as the fragments in Eusebius give us reason to suppose, sang in such wise of the town of Jerusalem as to give at the same time a history of the Jewish kings.

As to the date of Philo this much only can be said, that he preceded Alexander Polyhistor. Hence he may be perhaps placed in the second century before Christ. There is no direct evidence that he was a Jew, but from the tenor of his poem it can scarcely be doubtful.

Comp. in general: Huetius, *Demonstr. ev. Prop.* iv. c. 2, § 33. Viger's *Anm. zu Euseb.* ix. 20. Philippson, *Ezechiel des jüdischen Trauerspieldichters Auszug aus Egypten und Philo des Älteren Jerusalem*, 1830. Delitzsch, *Zur Gesch. der jüd. Poesie* (1836), pp. 24, 209. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religions-Philosophie*, ii. 215, note. Cruice, *De Fl. Josephi fide* (1844), p. 61 sq. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iii. 207 sqq. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 519, 575. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 338, vii. 91. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyhistor*, pp. 34, 100, 170.

2. Theodotus.

The poem of Theodotus on Sichem, a long portion from which is given partly by verbal quotation, partly by a statement of its contents, in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 22, seems to have been of the same kind as that of Philo on Jerusalem. The entire portion refers to the *history of the town of Sichem*. Its situation is first described, and then its seizure by the

Hebrews, in accordance with Gen. xxxiv.; how Jacob first dwelt in Mesopotamia, there married and begat children, then departed with them to the district of Sichem, and received a portion of land from Emmor the king of Sichem; next, how Sichem the son of Emmor ravished Dinah, Jacob's daughter, whereupon Jacob declared himself ready to give Dinah to Sichem to wife, on condition that all the Sichemites should be circumcised; and lastly, how Simeon and Levi, two of Jacob's sons, slew Emmor and Sichem and, in conjunction with their brethren, destroyed the city of the Sichemites. Jacob's sojourn in Mesopotamia not being mentioned till after the description of the town of Sichem, and only as an introduction to the history of its seizure by the Hebrews which follows, it is evident that the history of the town of Sichem is the real theme of the poem; and since it is called a "holy city" (*ἱερὸν ἄστυ*), it can scarcely be doubted that Theodotus was a Samaritan. Hence the title *Περὶ Ἰουδαίων* given to the poem in Eusebius can hardly be accurate. At the commencement of the extract it is said, that the town had its name from Sikimios, a son of Hermes (*ἀπὸ Σικιμίου τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ*). Theodotus thus seems like other Hellenists to have embellished Jewish history with scraps from Greek mythology. The diction, as well as the construction of the hexameters, is better than Philo's. With respect to date, what was said of Philo applies here also.

Comp. in general: Huetius, *Demonstr. ev.* iv. 2. 32. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. gr.* x. 516. Müller, *Fragm. hist. gr.* iii. 207 sqq. Pauly's *Real-Enc. der class. Alterthumswissensch.*, art. "Theodotus," Nr. 13. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 520 sq., 576 sq. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 338, vii. 91. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyh.* p. 99 sq.

3. Ezekiel the Tragic Poet.

The most remarkable phenomenon in the department of Judæo-Hellenistic poetry is the manufacture of scriptural matter into Greek dramas. We know indeed of only one

such Jewish dramatist, Ezekiel; and it must be left uncertain whether he had either successor or predecessor. But at all events he composed other dramas besides the one which is known to us by extracts, being called "The poet of Jewish tragedies" (Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 23. 155: ὁ 'Εζεκίηλος ὁ τῶν 'Ιουδαϊκῶν τραγωδιῶν ποιητής. Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 28: 'Εζεκιήλος ὁ τῶν τραγωδιῶν ποιητής). We know more by extensive extracts in Eusebius and Clemens Alexandrinus (after Alexander Polyhistor) of one of them, which was called "*the Exodus*," 'Εξαγωγή, and which depicted the history of the departure of the Jews from Egypt (Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 23. 155: ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ δράματι "'Εξαγωγή." Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 29. 14, ed. Gaisford: ἐν τῷ δράματι τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ 'Εξαγωγή). The moment chosen as the starting-point of the action was apparently that when Moses fled to Midian after slaying the Egyptian (Ex. ii.); for the first extract transposes us to that period (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 28 = Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 23. 155-156). It is a long monologue of Moses, in which he relates the history of his life down to that juncture, and concludes with the words, that he is now in consequence a wanderer in a foreign land. He then sees the seven daughters of Raguel approaching (Ex. ii. 16 sqq.) and asks who they are, when Zipporah gives him the information. The further progress of the action is only alluded to in the extract, where we are told that the watering of the flock and the marriage of Zipporah with Moses now takes place (Ex. ii. 16 sqq.). In the second extract (Euseb. ix. 29. 4-6, ed. Gaisford) Moses relates a dream to his father-in-law, which the latter explains to mean, that Moses will attain to a high official post, and will have the knowledge of things past, present and future. In another scene (Euseb. ix. 29. 7-11, ed. Gaisford) it is represented, on the authority of Ex. iii.-iv., how God spoke to Moses from a burning bush and commissioned him to deliver the people of Israel from bondage. As God speaks invisibly from the bush, He is not made to appear on the stage, but only His voice is heard. The details

are pretty much in agreement with Ex. iii.-iv. In the extract which follows (Euseb. ix. 29. 12-13, ed. Gaisford) God gives (according to Ex. xi.-xii.) more exact directions concerning the departure and the celebration of the Passover. It cannot be decided, whether this also belongs to the scene of the bush. In a further scene (Euseb. ix. 29. 14, ed. Gaisford) an Egyptian enters, who has escaped the catastrophe in the Red Sea, and relates how the Israelites passed safely through the waters and the Egyptian host perished in them. Finally, in the last fragment (Euseb. ix. 29. 15-16) a messenger, in whom we are to imagine one sent to reconnoitre for the Israelites, announces to Moses the discovery of an excellent place of encampment at Elim, with twelve springs of water and seventy palm trees (Ex. xv. 27 = Num. xxxiii. 9). Then the messenger relates how a marvellously strong bird, nearly twice as large as an eagle, which all the other birds followed as their king, appeared. The description of this bird is also found, without mention of the name of Ezekiel, in Eustathius, *Comm. in Hexaemeron*, ed. Leo Allatius (1629), p. 25 sq.

From these fragments it appears, that the action agrees pretty closely with the scriptural narrative, though with many embellishments of detail. The poetry of the author is very prosaic. On the other hand a certain amount of skill in dramatizing the material cannot be denied him. The diction and versification (Iambic trimeters) are tolerably fluent. It has been doubted—incorrectly it seems to me—whether this drama was ever intended for representation. The aim of it is certainly the same as that of the scriptural dramas of the Middle Ages (the passion plays, etc.), viz. on the one hand to make the people, in this way also, better acquainted with sacred history, on the other and chiefly, to supplant as far as possible profane and heathen pleasures by the supply of such “wholesome food.” Here perhaps, as in other productions of Judæo-Hellenistic literature, heathen readers and spectators were calculated on.

That Ezekiel was a Jew is undoubtedly shown even by his

name. What was said of the dates of Philo and Theodotus applies in his case also.

Comp. in general: Huetius, *Demonstr. evang.* iv. 2. 24. Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, ii. 305 sq., viii. 624 sq., 635, 636. Eichhorn, "De Judaeorum re scenica," in the *Commentationes Societ. Gotting. recentiores*, vol. ii. Gotting. 1813. Philippson, *Ezechiel des jüdischen Trauerspieldichters Auszug aus Egypten und Philo des Aelteren Jerusalem*, 1830. Delitzsch, *Zur Gesch. der jüdischen Poesie* (1836), pp. 28, 209, 211-219. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religions-Philosophie*, ii. 199 sq. Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i. 264. Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (1851), pp. 113-119. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 517-519. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. 127, iv. 338. Bähr in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iii. 365. Dübner in the appendix to *Fragmenta Euripidis, iterum*, ed. F. G. Wagner (*accedunt indices locupletissimi, Christus patiens, Ezechiel et christianorum poetarum reliquiae dramaticae*), Paris, Didot 1846, pp. 7-10 and 1-7. Magnin, *Journal des Savants*, 1848, pp. 193-208 (Recension of Dübner's appendix to *Fragm. Eurip.* ed. Wagner). Dindorf, *Praefat.* to his edition of Euseb. *Opp.* vol. i. pp. 19-25. Bernhardt, *Grundriss der griechischen Literatur*, ii. 2 (3rd ed. 1872), p. 76. Cobet in the *Λογιοε Ερμης*, i. 457-459.

V. PHILOSOPHY.

In the departments of history and poetry it was chiefly only the external form that was borrowed from the Greeks, but in that of philosophy a real internal blending of Jewish and Greek *thought*, a strong actual influencing of Jewish belief by the philosophy of the Greeks, took place. We perceive this the most plainly in Philo. He exhibits a completely double aspect; on one side he is a Jew, on the other a Greek philosopher (particulars, § 34). But we should be much mistaken if we took him for an isolated phenomenon in the history of his people and age. He is but a classic representative of a current flowing through centuries and necessarily implied by the nature of Hellenistic Judaism. To Greek *culture* belonged also an acquaintance with the great thinkers of the Greeks. The Hellenistic Jews, in appropriating the

former, thereby placed themselves also under the influence of Greek philosophy. We have certain proofs of this since the second century before Christ. But we may assume, that the fact mentioned is in general as old as Hellenistic Judaism itself. The Jew, whom Aristotle met in Asia Minor, was already 'Ελληνικὸς οὐ τῇ διαλέκτῳ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ (see vol. ii. 225).

The Jewish feature of this Judaeo-Hellenistic philosophy appears chiefly in the fact, that like the Palestinian חכמה it pursued essentially *practical aims*. Not logic or physics, but ethic was in its sight the chief matter. This ethic was indeed often founded upon the theoretic philosophy of the Greeks. Still the latter is but a means to an end, the proper end of Jewish philosophers, viz. the practical one of educating man to true morality and piety.

Also in the choice made of the *literary form*, the Jewish foundation is still apparent. The case here is exactly the reverse of what it is in poetry. The contents exhibit a strong Greek influence, but the literary form is derived from Palestine. The author of the Wisdom of Solomon chooses the form of *proverbs*, Philo gives his discussions in the manner of Rabbinic *Midrash*, i.e. in prolix learned commentaries on the text of the Pentateuch, from which the most heterogeneous philosophic ideas are developed by the help of allegorical exegesis. The so-called fourth Book of the Maccabees is a hortatory address, of which the synagogue sermon may perhaps be regarded as the model. Only in a few smaller pieces does Philo choose the form of inquiry and dialogue after Greek models.

In the *mixture of Jewish and Greek notions* in these writers the proportions of course vary. In some the influence of Greek ideas is stronger, in others weaker. But even those which are most saturated with Greek ideas are essentially rooted in the soil of Judaism. For they not only insist upon the unity of a supramundane God and the control of Divine Providence, which punishes the wicked and rewards the good, but they also firmly adhere to the belief

that the most perfect knowledge of things human and divine is given in the Mosaic revelation, so that Judaism is the way to true wisdom and virtue. And not only does the amount of Greek influence vary, but different Greek systems are preferred, now one, now another being more agreed with. Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics and Pythagoreans have all furnished material to the sphere of ideas of these Jewish philosophers. Especially in the Platonico-Pythagorean and in the Stoic teaching did Jewish thinkers find many elements capable of being assimilated with the Jewish faith. That the appropriation of these was always eclectic is self-evident. But here Jewish philosophy only participates in the fundamental characteristic of later Greek philosophy in general.

1. *The Wisdom of Solomon.*

We place the so-called "Wisdom of Solomon" first, not because it is certainly the oldest of the literary productions to be here discussed, but because it most closely resembles in form the ancient Palestinian *proverbial wisdom*. In like manner as Jesus the son of Sirach does the author praise true wisdom, which is to be found only with God, and is imparted to man by God alone. But the execution is quite different from that of Jesus Sirach. While the latter shows, how the truly wise man comports himself in the different circumstances of practical life, this book is properly only *a warning against the folly of ungodliness*, and especially of idolatry. Around this one theme do the contents of the whole book revolve, and consequently the proverbial form is not strictly adhered to, but often passes into that of connected discourse.

According to chap. ix. 7 sqq., Solomon himself is to be regarded as the speaker, and those addressed are the judges and kings of the earth (i. 1: οἱ κρίνοντες τὴν γῆν; vi. 1: βασιλεῖς, δικασταὶ περάτων γῆς). Thus it is properly an exhortation of Solomon to *his royal colleagues the heathen potentates*. He, the wisest of all kings, represents to them

the folly of ungodliness, and the excellence of true wisdom. Its contents may be divided into three groups. It is first shown (chaps. i.-v.) that the wicked and ungodly, although for a period apparently prosperous, will not escape the judgments of God, but that the pious and just, after having been for a time tried by sufferings, attain to true happiness and immortality. In a second section (chaps. vi.-ix.) Solomon directs his royal colleagues to his own example. It is just because he has loved high and divine wisdom, and has united himself to her as his bride, that he has attained to glory and honour. Hence he still prays for such wisdom. The third section (chaps. x.-xix.) points out, by referring to the history of Israel, and especially to the different lots of the Israelites and the Egyptians, the blessing of godliness and the curse of ungodliness. A very long tirade on the folly of idolatry (chaps. xiii.-xv.) is here inserted.

The work being in its chief contents a warning against the folly of ungodliness, it can only be so far intended for Jewish readers, as ungodliness was to be found among them also. But we should be hardly mistaken, if we were to suppose, that the author had heathen readers, at least as much in view. The numerous allusions to Scripture history seem indeed to presuppose Jewish readers (so *e.g.* Grimm, *Exeget. Handb.* p. 27). But then what is the purpose of the garment chosen, according to which the kings and potentates of the earth are addressed? Why the long-winded discourse on the folly of idolatry, for which there was no occasion with Jewish readers, who still deserved the name? The contents recall in many respects the Sibylline oracles, which, going forth under a heathen authority, were certainly intended for heathen readers. As in these so in the book in question the folly of an ungodly life is set before its readers. At all events its warning and instruction are addressed to heathen-minded readers, whether these are by birth Jews or heathen, and chiefly indeed to the great and mighty of this world.

The special theological *standpoint* of the author agrees with

that of Palestinian proverbial wisdom, as we find it in the Proverbs of Solomon and in Jesus the son of Sirach. *Divine Wisdom is the supreme good*, the source of all truth, virtue and happiness with our author also. But while, like the author of the Book of Proverbs and Jesus Sirach, he starts from the assertion, that this Wisdom is first of all present with God, it becomes in his conception almost an independent person beside God. His utterances indeed do not seem to really exceed what we already read in Prov. viii.—ix. But what is there more a poetic personification becomes with him a philosophic theory. Wisdom is according to him a breath (*ἀτμός*) of God's power, a pure effluence (*ἀπόρρῳια*) from the glory of the Almighty, the brightness (*ἀπαύγασμα*) of the everlasting light (vii. 25, 26). It is most intrinsically united with God (*συμβίωσιν θεοῦ ἔχουσα*), is initiated into the knowledge of God (*μύστις τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιστήμης*), and a chooser of His works (*αἰρέτις τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ*), i.e. chooses among the works, of which God has conceived the idea, which shall be carried into execution (viii. 3, 4: comp. Grimm on the passage), is assessor on God's throne (ix. 4: *ἡ τῶν σῶν θρόνων πάρεδρος*), understands the works of God, and was present when He created the world, knows what is well-pleasing in His eyes and right according to His commandments (ix. 9). Wisdom is thus not only represented as the special possession of God, but as an assistant of God, originating from His own nature. Together therewith "the almighty word of God" (*ὁ παντοδύναμός σου λόγος*) is also personified in a manner which approaches hypostatic union (xviii. 15 sq.). Thus we have here already the elements, from which the Philonian doctrine of the *λόγος* (= reason and word of God) as a hypostasis mediating between God and the world is formed. For Wisdom occupies in our author a position similar to that of Philo's Logos with respect to the world also. She has a spirit which is easily moving, all-overseeing, all-pervading (vii. 22–24: *εὐκίνητον, πανεπίσκοπον, διήκει καὶ χωρεῖ διὰ πάντων*, etc.). She works everything (viii. 5: *τὰ πάντα*

ἐργαζομένη), rules all things (viii. 1: διοικεῖ τὰ πάντα), makes all things new (vii. 27: τὰ πάντα καινίζει). "By passing from generation to generation into holy souls, she prepares friends of God and prophets" (vii. 27). It is she who was manifested in the history of Israel, *e.g.* in the pillar of fire and cloud, which led the Israelites through the wilderness (x. 17 and chap. x. in general). Hence Wisdom is in a word the medium by which God works in the world. The tendency of this whole speculation is evidently the same as in Philo, *viz.* to secure, by the insertion of such an intermediary, the absolute supramundane nature of God, who cannot be conceived of as in direct contact with a sinful world. But it must not be lost sight of, that it is by no means our author's concern to dwell upon this thought. He desires, on the contrary, to exhibit Divine Wisdom as the supreme good. He does not seek to show that Wisdom is different from God, but, on the contrary, how near it is to Him. While then he is moving in this sphere of thought, he merely takes up a view already current among his associates.¹⁴

The *influence of Greek philosophy* is moreover shown in the details of execution. The formulae, with which the rule of wisdom in the world is described (vii. 24: διήκει, χωρεῖ; viii. 1: διοικεῖ), recall the Stoic doctrine of the world-spirit of God as the wisdom of the world immanent in and pervading it.¹⁵ The enumeration also of the four cardinal virtues (viii. 7: σωφροσύνη, φρόνησις, δικαιοσύνη, ἀνδρεία) is to be referred to Stoic influence (see Zeller as above). The psychology of the author on the other hand is Platonico-dualistic. The soul of man is pre-existent. If it is good, it enters an undefiled body (viii. 20: ἀγαθὸς ὢν ἦλθον εἰς σῶμα ἀμίαντον). The body

¹⁴ Compare on this "doctrine of Wisdom" in general: Lücke, *Comentar über das Ev. Joh.* i. p. 257 sqq. Bruch, *Weisheitslehre der Hebräer, ein Beitrag zur Gesch. der Philosophie*, Strassb. 1851. Oehler, *Grandzüge der alttestamentl. Weisheit*, Tüb. 1855. Grimm, *Exeget. Handb. zu den Apokr.* Pt. vi. p. 1 sq.

¹⁵ Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. (3rd ed. 1881) p. 271 Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos*, p. 192.

is only an "earthly tabernacle" for the *νοῦς* (ix. 15 : γεῶδες σκῆνος). After a short time the body must restore the soul like a loan and then fall to dust (xv. 8). In this anthropology the territory of the Jewish view is entirely forsaken. Instead of a resurrection of the body, we have here the Greek view of the immortality of the soul.

With respect to the author's *date*, it must be regarded as certain that he succeeds Jesus the son of Sirach, but *precedes Philo*. For his standpoint is a preliminary step to Philo's. This would not in itself prove a higher antiquity. But with the near affinity of the two, it is not conceivable, that our author would have remained unaffected by Philo if he had succeeded him. There is absolutely no foundation for the notion (as *e.g.* by Weisse) of Christian origin. That the author was an Alexandrian may, by reason of the great prominence of references to Egyptian matters, be regarded as certain. On the other hand it cannot be imagined, that Philo was himself the author of this book, as was believed by some even in the time of Jerome (Hieron. *praef. in vers. libr. Salom. Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ix. 1293 sq. : "Nonnulli scriptorum veterum hunc esse Judaei Philonis affirmant"); and also by many moderns, as Luther, Joh. Gerhard, Calovius, and others (see Grimm, *Handb.* p. 21 sqq.). The authorship of Philo is entirely excluded by the difference of his sphere of thought.

The book has been used from the beginning in the *Christian Church*. Even in the *Pauline Epistles* such loud echoes are found as make St. Paul's acquaintanceship with the book probable (see Bleek, *Stud. und Krit.* 1853, pp. 340-344; on the other side, Grimm, *Exeget. Handb.* p. 35 sqq.). It is tolerably certain that it was known to Clemens Romanus (Clem. Rom. xxvii. 5 = *Sap. Sal.* xii. 12, and xi. 21; comp. also Clem. lx. 1 = *Sap.* vii. 17). In Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, c. vii. *init.*, the same is said of Christ as is said (*Sap.* ii. 23) of God. Irenaeus, in his large work on heresy, nowhere quotes indeed *Sap. Sol.*, but borrows from it (iv. 38. 3) the saying: ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ θεοῦ (*Sap.* vi. 20). With reference to this Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* v. 8. 8) says of Irenaeus: Καὶ ῥητοῖς δὲ τισιν ἐκ τῆς Σολομῶντος σοφίας κέχρηται, μονονουχὶ φάσκων "Ορασις δὲ θεοῦ περιποιητικὴ ἀφθαρσίας, ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ θεοῦ. In the βιβλίον διαλέξεων διαφόρων,

which has not come down to us, Irenaeus, according to the testimony of Eusebius, expressly quoted from the Book of Wisdom (*Hist. eccl.* v. 26: τῆς λεγομένης σοφίας Σολομῶντος ἀνημνεύει). *Canon Muratorianus*, lin. 69–71: “Sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta.” See also Hesse, *Das muratorische Fragment* (1873), p. 239 sqq. Tertullian, *adv. Valentinianos*, c. 2, refers to Wisd. i. 1 in the words: “ut docet ipsa Sophia, non quidem Valentini sed Salomonis.” Tertullian also made use of the Book of Wisdom. Clemens Alexandrinus quotes it nine times, and frequently makes use of it besides. The express quotations are introduced as either sayings of Solomon (so *Strom.* vi. 11. 93, 14. 110, 14. 114, 15. 120–121), or of the σοφία (*Paedag.* ii. 1. 7; *Strom.* ii. 2. 5, iv. 16. 103–104, v. 14. 89), or with the formula εἶρηται (*Strom.* vi. 14. 113). Hippolytus repeatedly quotes the book as a genuine προφητεία Σολομῶν περὶ Χριστοῦ (*adv. Judaeos*, § 9 and 10 = Lagarde, p. 66 sq.), especially the passage ii. 12–20, which is also frequently interpreted in a Messianic sense by moderns (see vol. ii. p. 139).

Origen is, after the author of the Muratorian Fragment, the first to intimate a doubt with respect to the Solomonian authorship. He quotes it with the sceptical formula as ἡ ἐπιγεγραμμένη τοῦ Σολομῶντος σοφία (*in Joann.* vol. xx. c. 4 = Lommatzsch, ii. 202), ἡ σοφία ἡ ἐπιγεγραμμένη Σολομῶντος (*in Jerem. homil.* viii. 1 = Lommatzsch, xv. 193), ὁ περὶ τῆς σοφίας εἰπών (*Selecta in Jerem.* c. 29 = Lommatzsch, xv. 453), ἐν τῇ ἐπιγεγραμμένῃ Σολομῶντος σοφίᾳ (*contra Cels.* v. 29 = Lommatzsch, xix. 216), “in sapientia quae dicitur Salomonis, qui utique liber non ab omnibus in auctoritate habetur” (*de principiis*, iv. 33 = Lommatzsch, xxi. 472 sq.). But he quotes it almost as frequently simply as a work of Solomon. And that it is to him a canonical book is especially shown by the entire section, *de principiis*, i. 2. 5–13, where he uses the passage Wisd. vii. 25, 26 together with Col. i. 15 and Heb. i. 3 as fundamental passages from which he develops his Christology. The whole section, *de princ.* i. 2. 9–13, is nothing but an exegetical discussion of Wisd. vii. 25, 26. On the whole, there are about forty quotations from this book in Origen.

Cyprian uses the Book of Wisdom as in the fullest sense canonical. He quotes it as Sapientia Salomonis (*Testim.* ii. 14, iii. 16, 53, 58, 59, 66; *Ad Fortunatum*, c. 1), scriptura divina (*De habitu virginum*, c. 10; *Epist.* vi. 2), scriptura sancta (*Ad Demetrianum*, c. 24), or with the formulae as scriptum est (*De zelo et livore*, c. 4; *Epist.* iv. 1, lv. 22), per Salomonem docet spiritus sanctus, and the like (*De mortalitate*, c. 23; *Ad Fortunatum*, c. 12). He quotes, two or three times, passages from the Proverbs with the formula in Sapientia Salomonis

(*Testim.* iii. 1, 6, 16, 56); and once a passage from Wisdom with the formula in Ecclesiastico (*Testim.* iii. 112); but both from inadvertence, since he elsewhere decidedly distinguishes between Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom.

The *manuscripts, editions and ancient translations* (together with their editions) are the same for this book as for Ecclesiasticus (see above, p. 29), the two books being as a rule combined with each other. The *cod. Vaticanus* has been used for our book in Fritzsche's edition of the Apocrypha, but apparently only according to the data in Reusch (*Observ. crit.* 1861), which on their part rest upon the untrustworthy edition of the codex by Mai (see upon this, p. 11 above). Valuable contributions to the textual criticism are given in Reusch, *Observationes criticae in librum Sapientiae*, Frib. 1861. The separate edition (Reusch, *Liber Sapientiae graece*, Frib. 1858) gives the text of the Sixtine edition. An edition of the Greek text with the old Latin and the Authorized English translation: Deane, *Σοφία Σαλωμων, The Book of Wisdom, the Greek text, the Latin Vulgate and the Authorized English version, with an introduction, critical apparatus and a commentary*, Oxford 1881.

The *exegesis in general*, see above, p. 11. Commentaries: Bauermeister, *Commentarius in Sapientiam Salomonis*, Götting. 1828. Grimm, *Commentar über das Buch der Weisheit*, Leipzig 1837. J. A. Schmid, *Das Buch der Weisheit, übersetzt und erklärt*, 1858 (Cathol.). Grimm, *Das Buch der Weisheit erklärt (Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen, 6 pts.)*, Leipzig 1860 (not a new edition of the former work, but an entirely new one). Gutberlet, *Das Buch der Weisheit, übersetzt und erklärt*, 1874 (Cathol.). Deane in the above-named separate edition. The older literature in Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, iii. 727-732. Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* iii. 219-221. Grimm, *Exeget. Handb.* p. 45 sq. Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. i. 496.

Separate investigations: Salthenius, *Diss. critico-theol. de auctore libri Sapientiae Philone potius Alexandrino quam seniore*, Regim. 1739. Bretschneider, *De libri Sapientiae parte priore c. i.-xi. e duobus libellis conflata*. Pts. i.-iii. Viteb. 1804. Winzer, *De philosophia morali in libro Sap. exposita*, Viteb. 1811. Grimm, *De Alexandrina Sapientiae libri indole perperam asserta*, Jen. 1833 (subsequently withdrawn by himself). Gfrörer, *Philo*, vol. ii. (1831) pp. 200-272. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie*, vol. ii. (1834) pp. 152-180. Bruch, *Weisheitslehre der Hebräer*, Strassb. 1851, pp. 322-378. Schmieder, *Ueber das B. der Weisheit*, 1853. Weisse, *Die Evangelienfrage* (1856), p. 202 sqq. Noach, *Psyche*, iii. 2, pp. 65-102. Nägelsbach in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. xvii. 622 sqq. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 626 sqq.

The same, *Jahrbb. der bibl. Wissensch.* iii. 264 sq., ix. 234 sq., x. 219 sq., xi. 223 sqq. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881), pp. 271–274. Kübel, “Die ethischen Grundanschauungen der Weisheit Salomo’s” (*Stud. und Krit.* 1865, pp. 690–722). Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos* (1872), pp. 192–202. Fritzsche in Schenkel’s *Bibelllex.* v. 647 sqq. Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. ii. 259 sqq. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vol. iii. (3rd ed. 1878) pp. 628–630 (note 3). Perez, *La Sapienza di Salomone, saggio storico-critico*, Firenze 1871. The same, *Sopra Filone Alessandrino e il suo libro detto, “La Sapienza di Salomone,”* Palermo 1883. The Introductions of Jahn, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Welte, Scholz, Nöldeke, De Wette-Schrader, Reusch, Keil, Kaulen, Kleinert, Reuss (see above, p. 12).

2. *Aristobulus.*

The author of the Wisdom of Solomon is one whose views are still chiefly based upon the Palestinian Proverbial Wisdom, which in him is only peculiarly modified by the influence of Greek philosophy. The Alexandrian Aristobulus on the contrary is a Hellenistic philosopher in the proper sense. He is acquainted with, and expressly quotes the Greek philosophers Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and is at home with their views as a philosopher by profession.

The statements of the ancients do not indeed entirely agree as to his date. It may however pass for certain that he lived in the time of Ptolemy VI. Philometor, and therefore towards the middle of the second century before Christ (about 170–150 B.C.). He himself says, in one of his works addressed to Ptolemy, that the Greek translation of the Pentateuch was made “under King Philadelphus, thy ancestor” (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 12. 2, ed. Gaisford: ἐπὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Φιλαδέλφου βασιλέως, σοῦ δὲ προγόνου). Thus he at all events wrote under a descendant of Ptolemy II. Philadelphus. But both Clemens Alexandrinus and Eusebius in his *Chronicle* distinctly mention Philometor.¹⁶ The same

¹⁶ Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 22. 150: Ἀριστόβουλος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν πρὸς τὸν Φιλομήτορα. The reading here is guaranteed, for in Eusebius also, who

chronology is also presupposed, when Clemens Alexandrinus and Eusebius identify this Aristobulus with the one who is mentioned in the beginning of the second Book of Maccabees (2 Macc. i. 10).¹⁷ In opposition to such evidence, it cannot be taken into consideration, that Anatolius places him under Ptolemy II. Philadelphus,¹⁸ and that the only manuscript of the *Stromata* of Clemens Alexandrinus has erroneously Philadelphus instead of Philometor in one passage.¹⁹

According to Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 97, this Aristobulus wrote *βιβλία ἱκανά*. Probably Clemens does not mean to say that he wrote several books, but that the one work which he knew of his was an extensive one. We are indebted for further particulars to Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* i. 15. 72, i. 22. 150, v. 14. 97, vi. 3. 32), Anatolius (in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 32, 16–19, Anatolius was an older contemporary of Eusebius) and Eusebius (*Praep. evang.* vii. 14, viii. 10, xiii. 12). Aristobulus is also briefly mentioned by Origen (*contra Cels.* iv. 51). The only two passages which are verbally preserved are in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 10 and xiii. 12. For whatever other verbal quotations are found (Clemens, *Strom.* i. 22. 150 = Euseb. *Praep.* ix. 6. Clemens, *Strom.* vi. 3. 32 = Euseb. *Praep.* vii. 14) are certainly contained also in the text of these larger fragments.²⁰ The passage, which Cyrillus Alex. (*contra Julian.* p. 134, ed. Spanh.)

in the *Praep. evang.* ix. § gives this passage from Clemens, the manuscripts all have *Φιλομήτορα*. Euseb. *Chron. ad Olymp.* 151 (ed. Schoene, ii. 124 sq.). The Greek text, which is preserved in the *Chronicon paschale*, is as follows: *Αριστόβουλος Ἰουδαῖος περιπατήτικὸς φιλόσοφος ἐγνωρίζετο, ὃς Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Φιλομήτορι ἐξηγήσεις τῆς Μωϋσέως γραφῆς ἀνέθηκεν*. So too the Armenian and Jerome. The 151st Olympiad = 176–172 B.C.

¹⁷ Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 97. Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 9, *fin.*

¹⁸ Anatolius in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 32. 16.

¹⁹ Clemens, *Strom.* v. 14. 97. The *cod. Laurentianus*, i.e. the only manuscript in which the *Stromata* of Clemens has come down to us (for the *Parisinus*, saec. 15, is only a copy from it), has here *Φιλαδέλφον*. Modern editors have however correctly replaced it by *Φιλομήτορα*.

²⁰ Namely: (1) Clem. *Str.* i. 22. 450 = Eus. *Pr.* ix. 6 = Eus. *Pr.* xiii. 12. 1. (2) Clem. *Strom.* vi. 3. 32 = Eus. *Pr.* viii. 10. 14. (3) Eus. *Pr.* vii. 14 = Eus. *Pr.* xiii. 12. 10–11.

ascribes to Aristobulus, is derived from the third Book of the *Indica* of Megasthenes, and has been only ascribed to Aristobulus in consequence of a very inconsiderate use of Clem. Al. *Strom.* i. 15. 72.

The work which was in the hands of these Fathers is designated as *an explanation of the Mosaic laws*.²¹ According however to the fragments preserved, we must conceive of it not as an actual commentary on the text, but as a *free reproduction of the contents of the Pentateuch*, in which the latter is philosophically explained. Hence it is not Philo's allegorical commentaries on single passages of the text, but his systematic delineation of the Mosaic legislation, the characteristics of which have been described p. 219 above, which is analogous to it. Like Philo, Aristobulus already seems to have given a connected representation of the contents of the Pentateuch, for the purpose of showing to the cultured heathen world, that the Mosaic law, if only correctly understood, already contained all that the best Greek philosophers subsequently taught. The work was first of all intended for King Ptolemy Philometor himself,²² who is therefore addressed in the text (Eus. *Pr.* viii. 10. 1 sqq., xiii. 12. 2). Hence it is self-evident, that it is addressed simply to heathen readers. His chief object was, as Clement says, to show "that the peripatetic philosophy was dependent upon the law of Moses and the other prophets" (*Strom.* v. 14. 97: Ἀριστοβούλῳ . . . βιβλία πεπόνηται ἱκανὰ, δι' ὧν ἀποδείκνυσιν τὴν περιπατητικὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἔκ τε τοῦ κατὰ Μωυσέα

²¹ Euseb. *Praep. evang.* vii. 13. 7, ed. Gaisford: τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων ἑρμηνείαν. Euseb. *Chron. ad Olymp.* 151 (ed. Schoene, ii. 124 sq.): ἐξηγήσεις τῆς Μωυσέως γραφῆς (this Greek wording, preserved by means of the *Chron. paschale*, is confirmed by the Armenian [enarrationem librorum Moysis] and by Jerome [explanationem in Moysen commentarios]). Anatolius in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 32. 16: βίβλους ἐξηγητικὰς τοῦ Μωϋσέως νόμου.

²² Clemens Al. *Strom.* i. 22. 150=Eus. *Praep. evang.* ix. 6. 6: ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν πρὸς τὸν Φιλομήτορα. Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 9, fin.: ἐν τῷ πρὸς Πτολεμαίου τὸν βασιλέα συγγράμματι. Euseb. *Praep. evang.* vii. 13, fin. Anatolius in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 32. 16.

νόμου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἡρτῆσθαι προφητῶν). This is substantially confirmed by the fragments preserved, only instead of the peripatetic the Greek philosophy in general should rather be spoken of. For Aristobulus is not contented with exhibiting the intrinsic agreement of the Mosaic law with the philosophy of the Greeks, but roundly asserts *that the Greek philosophers, a Pythagoras, a Socrates, a Plato, derived their doctrines from Moses*, nay, that even the poets *Homer and Hesiod* borrowed much from him, for that the essential contents of the Pentateuch had been rendered into Greek long before the Greek translation of the Pentateuch made under Ptolemy Philadelphus.²³ This bold assertion, that Moses was the father of Greek philosophy and culture, was embraced also by later Jewish Hellenists. Especially do we again meet with it in Philo.

The fragments preserved give us at least an approximate notion of the execution in detail. A large portion of the passages are employed in settling the true sense of the Biblical anthropomorphisms. Thus *e.g.* the long passage in Euseb. *Pr. evang.* xiii. 12. 1-8, which, according to the parallel passage in Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 22. 150 = Euseb. *Pr.* ix. 6, is taken from the first book of Aristobulus' work, and evidently belonged to the explanation of the history of the Creation, shows, that nothing else is meant by the words "God said, and it was," than that everything came to pass by the operation (δυνάμει) of God, as indeed was taught by the Greek philosophers Orpheus and Aratus. The following passage (Eus. *Pr.* xiii. 12. 9-16), which also belonged to the explanation of the history of the Creation, treats of the seventh day as the day of rest, and explains its meaning by an appeal, among other things, to supposed verses of Hesiod, Homer, and Linus.²⁴ Another passage (Eus. *Pr.* viii. 10)

²³ See especially Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 12. 1 = Clemens, *Strom.* i. 22. 150 = Euseb. *Praep.* ix. 6. 6-8. Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato. Eus. *Pr.* xiii. 12. 4, ed. Gaisford. Homer and Hesiod: Eus. *Pr.* xiii. 12. 13.

²⁴ A small portion of this (Eus. *Pr.* xiii. 12. 10-11) is also found *Pr. evang.* vii. 14.

shows what we are to understand, when the hands, arms, face and feet of God, or a walking of God, are spoken of.²⁵ Lastly, the extract from Anatolius, given in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 32. 17–18, is occupied with the Passover, which is celebrated, when both the sun and moon are in the equinox, viz. the sun in the vernal, and the moon opposite him in the autumnal equinox. Just this fragment shows, that Aristobulus by no means occupied himself with only philosophically explaining away the text of the Pentateuch, but that he really gave a description and explanation of the Mosaic law. While endeavouring however to settle its meaning, he often enters, as Origen especially intimates (*contra Cels.* iv. 51), into the region of allegorical interpretation.

The fragments give no further disclosure concerning the *philosophical standpoint* of Aristobulus. It may without any hesitation be assumed that he was an eclectic. The fragment on the meaning of the Sabbath “enters into a Pythagorean-like dilation on the power of the number seven.”²⁶ Elsewhere Aristobulus appeals not only generally to Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato, but, when entering more into detail, to the peripatetic doctrine in particular.²⁷ That he the more closely adhered to the latter is vouched for by the Fathers, who unanimously call him a *peripatetic*.²⁸

It is almost incomprehensible, that many more recent scholars (*e.g.* Richard Simon, Hody, Eichhorn, Kuenen, Grätz, Joel) should have disputed the genuineness of the whole work of Aristobulus. The picture, which we obtain from the fragments of the work that have come down to us, so entirely coincides with all that we elsewhere learn of the intellectual tendency of Hellenistic Judaism, that there is absolutely no occasion for any kind of doubt. The sole reason against the

²⁵ A small sentence from it is found in Eus. *Pr.* viii. 10. 14; also in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 3. 32.

²⁶ Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2. (3rd ed.) p. 264.

²⁷ Eus. *Pr.* ev. xiii. 12. 10–11 = vii. 14.

²⁸ Clemens, *Strom.* i. 15. 72, v. 14. 97. Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 9, *fin.*, ix. 6. 6. *Chron. ad Olymp.* 151 (ed. Schoene, ii. 124 sq.).

genuineness, which at all deserves mention, is the certainly indisputable fact that Aristobulus cites supposed verses of Orpheus, Hesiod, Homer, and Linus, which are certainly forged by a Jew. It is thought, that such audacity is inconceivable in a work intended for King Ptolemy himself. The assumption on which the argument starts is, that the verses were forged by Aristobulus himself—an assumption not only incapable of proof, but in the highest degree improbable. The verses were probably derived from an older Jewish work (see on this point No. VII.), and adopted by Aristobulus in all good faith in their genuineness. Aristobulus only did what later Christian apologists have also done, without thereby affording a ground for doubting the genuineness of their works.

The entire work of Aristobulus is said, according to a marginal note in the cod. Laurentianus of Clemens Alexandrinus' *Stromata*, to have been still extant towards the close of the Middle Ages in a library at Patmos (on *Strom.* i. 22. 150, a hand of the fifteenth or sixteenth century remarks: 'Ἀριστοβούλου βίβλος αὕτη ἢ πρὸς τὸν Φιλομήτορα ἔστιν εἰς τὴν Πάτμον, ἣν ἔγωγε οἶδα; see the note in Dindorf's ed.). Whether this note is worthy of credence is however very doubtful.

Compare in general: Richard Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, pp. 189, 499. Hody, *De bibliorum textibus*, p. 50 sqq. Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, i. 164, iii. 469 sq. Eichhorn, *Allgem. Bibliothek der biblischen Literatur*, vol. v. (1793) pp. 253–298. Valckenaer, *Diatribē de Aristobulo Judaeo, philosopho peripatetico Alexandrino*, Lugd. Bat. 1806 (chief work). Gabler's *Journal für auserlesene theolog. Literatur*, vol. v. (1810) pp. 183–209 (advertisement of Valckenaer's work). Winer in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgem. Encyclop.* § 1, vol. v. (1820) p. 266. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, i. (1829) p. 448. Gfrörer, *Philo*, ii. 711–21. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie*, ii. 73–112. Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i. 53 sq. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 473 sqq., 564 sqq. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 335 sqq. Teuffel in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* i. 2 (2nd ed.), p. 1600. Cobet in the *Λογίος Ἑρμῆς*, i. (1866) pp. 173–177, 521. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2 (3rd ed.), pp. 257–264. Ueberweg, *Grundriss*, 4th ed. i. 240 sqq. Binde, *Aristobulische Studien*, 2 pts. Glogau 1869–1870 (Gymnasialprogr.). Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos* (1872), pp. 185–192. Kuenen, *De godsdienst van Israël*, ii. (1870) pp. 433–440. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, pp. 166–169.

Grätz, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1878, pp. 49–60, 97–109. Joel, *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte zu Anfang des zweiten christlichen Jahrhunderts* (1880), pp. 77–100.

3. Philo.

Philo, the more recent fellow-countryman of Aristobulus by two centuries, represents the same tendency. His main effort also is to prove, that the views derived from Greek philosophers were genuinely Jewish. And this he does now for heathen, now for Jewish readers; for the former to inspire them with respect for Judaism, for the latter to educate them to such a Judaism as he himself represents. It may safely be assumed, that there were between Aristobulus and Philo other representatives of this tendency. For it presented itself in Philo with such assurance, and in such maturity of form, as would not be conceivable without historical connection. Nothing however of the supposed literary productions of such individuals has come down to us.

Since Philo, by reason of his eminent importance and the extent of his extant works, demands a separate delineation (§ 34), we will here only briefly mention those writings of his in which philosophical instruction and discussion form the main object. Among these are in the first place two of his principal works on the Pentateuch, viz.: (1) the *Ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις*, a short explanation of Genesis and Exodus in the form of questions and answers; and (2) the *Νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι*, the extensive allegorical commentaries on select passages of Genesis, in the form of Rabbinical Midrash. These form Philo's chief philosophical work properly so called, and constitute in extent about the half of Philo's still extant writings. (3) The work, *Περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον εἶναι ἐλεύθερον* (*Quod omnis probus liber*), properly only the second half of a work, whose first half, which is lost, dealt with the theme *περὶ τοῦ δούλον εἶναι πάντα φαῦλον*, was also occupied in the discussion of philosophical questions. (4) *Περὶ προνοίας*. (5) *Ἀλέξανδρος ἡ περὶ τοῦ λόγου ἔχειν τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα*. Particulars concerning

all these works will be found in § 34. The two last-named are also of interest, because Philo in them chooses the form of the Greek dialogue in discussing the theme.

4. *The Fourth Book of Maccabees.*

To philosophical literature belongs also the so-called fourth Book of Maccabees. For the Judaism, which the author recommends, is influenced by the Stoic philosophy.

In its *form* this piece of writing is a *discourse*. It directly addresses its hearers or readers (i. 1, xviii. 1).²⁹ The contents being of a religious and edifying kind, it might even be called a *sermon*, and the choice of this form referred to the custom of religious lectures in the synagogues. But when Freudenthal (pp. 4-36) emphatically insists that we have here an actual specimen of synagogue preaching, this is not only incapable of proof, but also improbable, the theme discoursed on being not a text of Holy Scripture, but a philosophic proposition.

The author had only Jews in view, whether as hearers or readers (xviii. 1: ὁ τῶν Ἀβραμαίων σπερμάτων ἀπόγονοι παῖδες Ἰσραηλῖται). He desires to show them, that it is not difficult to lead a pious life, if only they follow the precepts of "pious reason." For "*pious reason is the absolute ruler of the motives*" (i. 1: αὐτοδέσποτός ἐστι τῶν παθῶν ὁ εὐσεβὴς λογισμός). This proposition is the proper theme of the discourse; its meaning is first explained, and its truth afterwards proved by facts from Jewish history, especially by the laudable martyrdom of Eleazar, and the seven Maccabaeen brothers. A large portion of the contents is therefore devoted to a description of the martyrdom of these heroes of faith. In his grossly realistic delineation of the several tortures, the author shows even greater want of taste than the second Book of Maccabees, and the psychology assumed is as contrary as possible to nature. His authority seems to have been the second Book of

²⁹ I quote according to the division into chapters and verses of Fritzsche's edition of the Apocrypha.

Maccabees. At least it cannot be proved that he drew, as Freudenthal (pp. 72–90) supposes, from the larger work of Jason of Cyrene (2 Macc. ii. 23).

The author's own *standpoint* is influenced by *Stoicism*. The fundamental idea of the whole discourse is that of Stoic morality, viz. the rule of reason over impulse. The setting up too of four cardinal virtues (*φρόνησις, δικαιοσύνη, ἀνδρεία, σωφροσύνη*) is derived from Stoicism. But this influence of Stoicism does not anywhere penetrate more deeply with the author. Even the fundamental idea is transformed in Jewish fashion. For the reason, to which he ascribes dominion over desire, is not human reason as such, but *pious* reason: *ὁ εὐσεβὴς λογισμός* (i. 1, vii. 16, xiii. 1, xv. 20, xvi. 1, xviii. 2), i.e. reason *guiding itself according to the rule of the divine law* (comp. also i. 15 sq.). He also goes his own way in the description and division of the affections (see Freudenthal, p. 55 sqq.; Zeller, iii. 2. 276). But it would be doing him too much honour to designate him as an eclectic philosopher. He is but a dilettante in *philosophicis*, somewhat after the fashion of Josephus, who also knows how to give his Judaism a philosophic tinge. Of all Jewish philosophers known to us, our author stands relatively nearest to Pharisaism, for just what he extols in the Maccabaeon brethren is their punctilious adherence to the ceremonial law. Two of his Jewish views in particular may be brought forward as worthy of notice—(1) his belief in the resurrection, the form of which is not that of the Pharisaic belief in that doctrine, but the form met with among other Jewish Hellenists, of a faith in an eternal and blessed life of pious souls in heaven (xiii. 16, xv. 2, xvii. 5, xviii. *fin.*);³⁰ and (2) the notion that the martyrdom of the righteous serves as an atonement for the

³⁰ For further particulars, see Grimm, *Exeget. Handb.* p. 289, and Freudenthal, pp. 67–71. Caution is however needed in the settlement of details, because the text seems to be not quite free from Christian interpolations. See Freudenthal, p. 165 sqq. Such an interpolation are the words *εἰς τοὺς πόλπους αὐτῶν*, which are wanting in the cod. Alex. and Sin. The thought however remains the same even without these words.

sins of the people (vi. 29 : καθάρσιον αὐτῶν ποιήσον τὸ ἐμὸν αἷμα, καὶ ἀντίψυχον αὐτῶν λάβε τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν ; xvii. 29 : ἀντίψυχον γεγονότας τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους ἁμαρτίας).⁸¹

Josephus is named by Eusebius and other Church writers as the *author* of this book. This view however has only the value of a hypothesis. For the book still appears in many manuscripts anonymously, and was therefore certainly at first issued without the name of the author. The entirely different style, and the circumstance, that Josephus in his *Antiquities* nowhere makes use of the second Book of Maccabees and thus seems not to know it, while the work in question is entirely based upon it, speak against his authorship. The first century after Christ is generally accepted as the *date of composition*, chiefly because the book must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Though the latter cannot be proved, this view must be pretty nearly correct, since a more recent book would no longer have been accepted by the Christian Church.

Eusebius, speaking of the writings of Josephus, says concerning the *title* and *authorship*, *Hist. eccl.* iii. 10. 6 : Πεπόνηται δὲ καὶ ἄλλο οὐκ ἀγενὲς σπούδασμα τῷ ἀνδρὶ περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ, ὃ τινες Μακκαβαϊκὸν ἐπέγραψαν κ.τ.λ. Hieronymus, *De viris illustr.* c. 13 (Vallarsi, ii. 851) : "Alius quoque liber ejus, qui inscribitur περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ valde elegans habetur, in quo et Machabaeorum sunt digesta martyria." The same, *contra Pelagianos*, ii. 6 (Vallarsi, ii. 749) : "Unde et Josephus Machabaeorum scriptor historiae frangi et regi posse dixit perturbationes animi non eradicari (= 4 Macc. iii. 5)." The article in Suidas, *Lex. s.v.* Ἰώσηπος, is taken from the Greek translation of Hieron. *de viris illustris*, c. 13. For other authors who attribute this book to Josephus, see Grimm, *Handb.* p. 293 sq. It is also frequently attributed to Josephus in the MSS. (Grimm as above. Freudenthal, p. 117 sqq.). Its title as the fourth Book of Maccabees (Μακκαβαίων δ') is found in Philostorgius and Syncellus, and in some Scripture MSS., and indeed in the latter without the mention of Josephus as its author (so esp. *cod. Alex.* and *Sin.*). For further particulars, see Freudenthal, pp. 117-120. On the use of the book in Christian ascetic literature, see above, p. 214.

⁸¹ Comp. Freudenthal, p. 68.

The *manuscripts*, in which our book has come down, are *some of them manuscripts of Scripture, some of Josephus*. The former are not numerous, since as a rule only three books of Maccabees were received as canonical (Freudenthal, pp. 118, 119). Still the two most important manuscripts for our book are Scripture MSS., viz. the *codex Alexandrinus* (No. iii. in Fritzsche) and *Sinaiticus* (No. x. in Fritzsche). On the editions of these manuscripts, see above, p. 166. More concerning them will be found in Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* v. 26 sq. Grimm, *Handb.* p. 294. Freudenthal, pp. 120–127, 169 sq., 173. Fritzsche, *Prolegom.* p. xxi. sq. Collations chiefly in Havercamp's edition of *Josephus*, ii. 1. 497 sqq., ii. 2. 157 sqq. A fragment in Tischendorf, *Monumenta sacra inedita*, vol. vi. 1869. Various readings of a Florentine MS. (*Acquis. ser.* iii. No. 44) are given by Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, vol. ii. (1884) pp. 635–640.

The text is *printed* in accordance with the manuscripts, on the one hand in some editions of the Septuagint and in separate editions of the Apocrypha, on the other and chiefly in the *editions of Josephus*. Most of the editors have troubled themselves very little about the manuscripts. The first attempt at a recension of the text from the best authorities is made in Fritzsche's edition of the *Libri apocryphi Vet. Test. graece* (Lips. 1871). For more on the editions, see Grimm, *Handb.* p. 294 sq. Freudenthal, pp. 127–133.

Erasmus compiled a *Latin paraphrase* of this book (printed e.g. in Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 148–156). Nothing reliable is as yet known of any *ancient Latin translation* on which it is based. See Grimm, p. 296. Freudenthal, p. 133 sqq. The old *Syriac translation* is published in Ceriani's photo-lithographic edition of the Milan Peshito manuscript (see above, p. 92).

Grimm has given a careful commentary on this book in his *Exeget. Handb. zu den Apokryphen*, 4 parts, Leipzig 1857. Freudenthal's *Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift Ueber die Herrschaft der Vernunft* (4 *Makkabäerbuch*), *eine Predigt aus dem ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert, untersucht*, Breslau 1869, is a complete monograph. A German translation is contained in the *Bibliothek der griechischen und römischen Schriftsteller über Judenthum und Juden in neuen Uebersetzungen und Sammlungen*, 2 vols. Leipzig 1867.

Comp. in general: Gfrörer, *Philo*, ii. 173–200. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie*, ii. 190–199. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 632 sqq. Langer *Das Judenthum in Palästina* (1866), pp. 74–83. Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben*, 1869, pp. 113–116. Fritzsche in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* iv. 98–100. Keil, *Einl. in's*

A. T., 3rd ed. (1873) p. 722 sqq. Grätz, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1877, p. 454 sqq. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.'s*, § 570. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881), pp. 275-277.

VI. APOLOGETICS.

The peculiarity of the Jewish people involved the circumstance that the Jews were felt to be, more than other Orientals, an anomaly in the framework of the Graeco-Roman world. Denying all authority to other religions, they were paid in the same coin, and their right of existence upon the soil of Hellenistic culture disputed. The town municipalities tried to get rid of such inconvenient fellow-citizens; the populace was always ready to lift up a hand against them, while by the educated they were despised and derided (see vol. ii. pp. 273-276, 291). Hellenistic Judaism thus found itself continually at war with the rest of the Hellenistic world; it had ever to draw the sword in its own defence. *Hence a large share of the entire Graeco-Jewish literature subserves apologetic purposes.* Especially does the historic and philosophic literature essentially pursue the design of showing that the Jewish nation was, by reason of the greatness of its history and the purity of its teaching, if not superior, at least equal to others. Besides these indirectly apologetic works, there were also some *which sought in a systematic manner to refute the reproaches with which Judaism was assailed.* These were called forth by the sometimes utterly absurd fables propagated by certain Greek literati concerning the Jews, and generally by the direct accusations brought against them in Greek and Latin literature. These accusations had their rise in Egypt (Joseph. *contra Apion.* i. 25). Alexandrian literati were the first to write against the Jews. From these turbid waters later writers, especially Tacitus, drew. In what follows we shall speak in the first place of literary opponents, and afterwards of the apologetic works and the points of dispute themselves (Attack and Defence).

1. *The Literary Opponents.*

1. *Manetho* (comp. Josephus, *contra Apion.* i. 26-31). The Egyptian priest Manetho composed, in the time of Ptolemy II. Philadelphus, therefore about 270-250 B.C., a learned work on Egyptian history in the Greek language, derived from the sacred records themselves (Joseph. *contra Apion.* i. 14: γέγραφε Ἑλλάδι φωνῇ τὴν πάτριον ἱστορίαν, ἔκ τε τῶν ἱερῶν, ὡς φησὶν αὐτός, μεταφράσας. *Ibid.* i. 26. ὁ τὴν Αἰγυπτιακὴν ἱστορίαν ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων μεθερμηνεύειν ὑπεσχημένος). From these *Αἰγυπτιακά* of Manetho Josephus gives in two places long fragments, which however, as Josephus himself states, are of very different character. The portions (from the second Book of the *Αἰγυπτιακά*) in i. 14-16, which treat of the rule of the Hyksos in Egypt, make, by the copiousness of their contents and the conciseness of their form, the most favourable impression. Nothing in them gives occasion for doubting that their contents are really derived from the ancient records. Of quite another kind are the portions in i. 26, 27. These do not indeed pretend to be authentic history, but only give, according to Manetho's own confession, *the legends current concerning the Jews* (i. 16: ὁ Μανεθὼν οὐκ ἐκ τῶν παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις γραμμάτων, ἀλλ' ὡς αὐτὸς ὁμολόγηκεν, ἐκ τῶν ἀδεσπότης μυθολογουμένων προστέθεικεν. I. 26: μέχρι μὲν τούτων ἠκολούθησε ταῖς ἀναγραφαῖς, ἔπειτα δὲ δοὺς ἐξουσίαν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ φάναι γράψειν τὰ μυθεύμενα καὶ λεγόμενα περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, λόγους ἀπιθάνους παρενέβαλεν). It is here related, how King Amenophis of Egypt assembled in one place all the lepers of the country, 80,000 in number, and sent them to work in the stone quarries east of the Nile. After they had laboured there a long time they petitioned the king to assign to them the town of Auaris, which had formerly been inhabited by the Hyksos, as a place of residence. The king granted their request. When however they had taken possession of the

town, they were attacked by the king and chose a priest of Heliopolis named Osarsiph as their head, who gave them new laws, in which they were especially commanded to worship no gods and to kill the sacred animals. He also invoked the aid of the Hyksos from Jerusalem as allies. With their assistance the lepers now drove away King Amenophis and ruled Egypt for thirteen years. The priest Osarsiph then took the name of Moses. After the thirteen years the Hyksos and the lepers were driven out of Egypt by King Amenophis. This history concerning the origin of the Jews was therefore read in his text of Manetho by Josephus. Whether it is derived from Manetho himself is questionable. Many recent investigators, *e.g.* Boeckh, Carl Müller, Kellner, regard it as a later insertion.³² The possibility of its being such cannot be disputed, since this much read work already existed in various recensions even in the time of Josephus.³³ This view does not however appear to me to be probable in the case in question. For if an enemy of the Jews had subsequently inserted the passage, he would scarcely have been so truthful as expressly to bring forward the fact, that he was not giving a history accredited by ancient records, but only *τὰ μυθεύόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*. In these words we hear the strict investigator, who indeed as an enemy of the Jews cannot deny himself the reporting of these tales, but expressly distinguishes them as legends from authentic history. At any rate Josephus read the section in all the copies known to him of Manetho; for he says nothing of any difference in this respect.³⁴

³² Boeckh, *Manetho und die Hundsternperiode*, p. 302. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* ii. 514^b. Kellner, *De fragmentis Manethonianis*, p. 52 sq.

³³ In the passage, i. 14, Josephus gives a long extract from Manetho, in which the name *Hyksos* is explained by "Shepherd Kings." On this Josephus remarks, that "in another copy" (*ἐν ἄλλῃ ἀντιγράφῳ*) another explanation is given. *Ἐν ἄλλῃ δὲ τινὶ βίβλῳ* (i. 14 near the end) must be understood in the same sense, *i.e.* of another manuscript, not of another part of Manetho's work.

³⁴ It must not be urged (as by Kellner) against the origin of the section in question, that it is contradictory to the passage given, i. 14. Such a

The fragments of Manetho are best collected in Carl Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, vol. ii. (1848) pp. 511–616. Comp. on Manetho in general: Böckh, *Manetho und die Hundsternperiode, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Pharaonen*, Berlin 1845. Bähr in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iv. 1477 sqq. Nicolai, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, 2nd ed. vol. ii. (1876) pp. 198–200. Krall, "Die Composition und die Schicksale des Manethonischen Geschichtswerkes" (*Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie, philos.-histor. Classe*, vol. xcv., yearly course 1879, pp. 123–226), treats, pp. 152–169, especially of the fragments in Josephus.

On the fragments in Josephus: Hengstenberg, *Die Bücher Moses und Aegypten*, with an appendix: *Manetho und die Hyksos*, Berlin 1841. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel* (3rd ed.), ii. 110 sqq. Kellner, *De fragmentis Manethonianis, quae apud Josephum contra Apionem*, i. 14 and i. 26 sunt., Marburg 1859. J. G. Müller, *Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion* (Basel 1877), pp. 120 sqq., 185 sqq., 214 sqq.

2. *Apollonius Molon (or Molonis?)*. Among the literary opponents of Judaism Josephus frequently names one Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Μόλων (*contra Apion.* ii. 14, ii. 36), in a later passage ὁ Μόλων Ἀπολλώνιος (comp. ii. 7: Apollonium Molonis), whose full name he also abridges so as to write either only Ἀπολλώνιος (ii. 14 and ii. 37, twice) or only Μόλων (ii. 2, ed. Bekker, 226. 13; comp. ii. 33 and ii. 41: Μόλωνες). This adversary of the Jews in Josephus is undoubtedly identical with him, from whom Alexander Polyhistor gives a passage (in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 19: ὁ δὲ τὴν συσκευὴν τὴν κατὰ Ἰουδαίων γράψας Μόλων).³⁵ An orator of the same name (Apollonius Molon) is elsewhere frequently mentioned as the teacher of Cicero and Caesar and as a writer on rhetoric.³⁶ It seems however that some discrepancies had already crept in concerning him among the ancients. For

contradiction only exists if the Hyksos are identified—as by Josephus—with the Jews, which is certainly a mistake.

³⁵ The form Μόλων is given by Gaisford according to the better manuscripts; other editions have Μήλων.

³⁶ Quintilian, xii. 6. 7. Sueton. *Caesar*, 4. Quintilian, iii. 1. 16. Phœbammōn in *Rhetores graeci*, ed. Walz, viii. 494 (here Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Μόλων).

Strabo distinguishes two orators, an Apollonius and a Molon, evidently by reason of a more accurate knowledge of the matter. He mentions both (xiv. 2. 13, p. 655) as eminent men, who lived in Rhodes, and remarks that both came from Alabanda in Caria, but that Molon came to Rhodes subsequently to Apollonius, on which account Apollonius said to him, “ὄψὲ μολών.” Thus they were not only fellow-countrymen but contemporaries. Strabo also distinguishes them in another passage, in which he is enumerating the eminent men of Alabanda (xiv. 2. 26, p. 661). Cicero too mentions both, and indeed so that he calls the one only Apollonius, and the other, who was Cicero’s tutor, only Molon.³⁷ Hence we must certainly distinguish between the two. Apollonius however was called by his full name, Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ τοῦ Μόλωνος (Plutarch. Cicero 4, Caesar 3; Joseph. *Apion.* ii. 7); and he seems, by placing his father’s name beside his own, according to a custom which may be pointed to elsewhere, to have called himself Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Μόλων.^{37a} This gave rise to his being frequently confounded with Molon. Cicero had probably heard both, but his own teacher was Molon. We are here concerned, not with the latter, but with his older fellow-countryman Apollonius, who, according to Cicero, was already a noted teacher 120 years before Christ.³⁸

There existed before the end of the second century before

³⁷ For proof, see Riese, *Molon or Apollonius Molon?* (*Rhein. Museum*, 1879, pp. 627–630), from which the above details concerning the distinctness of the two men is taken.

^{37a} Comp. *Quaestiones epicae*, 1837, p. 23, note (with appeal to Sturz, *Opp.* p. 14). The supposition of Riese, that the name Apollonius Molon originated in a misunderstanding of the title-superscription Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Μόλωνος, is, according to what has been said, neither necessary nor probable.

³⁸ Cicero makes Scaevola say, *De orat.* i. 17. 75: “Quae, cum ego praetor Rhodum venissem et cum illo summo doctore istius disciplinae Apollonio ea quae a Panaetio acceperam contulissem, irrisit ille quidem, ut solebat, philosophiamque contempsit,” etc. Scaevola was praetor about A.U.C. 633=121 B.C. (see Pauly’s *Enc.* v. 183). Cicero also mentions this same Apollonius, *De oratore*, i. 28. 126 (*Alabandensem Apollonium*) and i. 28. 130 *De inventione*, i. 56. 109.

Christ, in Caria and Rhodes, sufficient occasion for the composition of a polemical work against the Jews by a living orator. For we know that just here the Jews were already numerously dispersed during the second century B.C.³⁹ The work of Apollonius was, according to Alexander Polyhistor, a *συσκευή κατὰ Ἰουδαίων* (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 19). Hence it dealt not merely occasionally, like Manetho's *Αἰγυπτιακά*, but exclusively with the Jews. As Josephus says Apollonius did not, like Apion, heap up his accusations in one place, but calumniated the Jews in many passages and throughout the work now in one manner now in another (*contra Apion.* ii. 14: *τὴν κατηγορίαν ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος οὐκ ἀθρόαν ὥσπερ ὁ Ἀπίων ἔταξεν, ἀλλὰ σποράδην καὶ διὰ πάσης τῆς συγγραφῆς . . . λοιδορεῖ*), hence it must be supposed that the work was *not* a purely polemical one, but that, in connection with statements concerning the Jews, it contained much polemical invective. This is also thoroughly confirmed by the fact, that the fragment in Alexander Polyhistor (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 19) is occupied in a purely objective manner with the history of Abraham. It follows from the allusions of Josephus, that the history of the exodus from Egypt was also treated of (*contra Apion.* ii. 2), and that the work "contained unjust and untrue reports concerning our legislator Moses and our laws" (ii. 14). In the latter respect we learn also that Apollonius reproached the Jews with "not worshipping the same gods as others" (ii. 7), with having no fellowship with those who believed differently (ii. 36), and with being therefore *ἄθεοι* and *μισάνθρωποι*, also as at one time cowardly, at another fanatic, as the most incapable among barbarians, and as having furnished nothing towards general culture (ii. 14). Josephus on his part repays Apollonius in

³⁹ Comp. 1 Macc. xv. 16-24 and Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 221. The Carian towns of Myndos, Halicarnassus and Cnidus and the neighbouring islands of Cos and Rhodes are presupposed (1 Macc. xv. 16-24 and elsewhere) to be abodes of the Jews. On Halicarnassus, comp. also Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 258 (Joseph. *Anti.* xiv. 10. 23).

his own coin, reproaching him with gross want of sense, arrogance and immoral conduct (ii. 36, 37).

Comp. on Apollonius in general: C. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iii. 208 sq. Creuzer, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 83 sq. Teuffel in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* l. 2 (2nd ed.), p. 1318. J. G. Müller, *Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion* (1877), p. 230. Riese, "Molon oder Apollonius Molon?" (*Rheinisches Museum*, vol. xxxiv. Jahrg. 1879, pp. 627-630).

3. *Lysimachus* (comp. Josephus, *contra Apion.* i. 34-35). The fragment which Josephus, *ibid.*, gives from the work of a certain Lysimachus relates to the departure of the Jews from Egypt, and narrates concerning it similar fables, but still more absurd than those told by Manetho. The few occasional notices which Josephus elsewhere (*contra Apion.* ii. 2, twice, and ii. 14) gives, refer to the same fact. According to *contra Apion.* ii. 2: Ἀπίων . . . τὸν αὐτὸν Λυσιμάχῳ σχεδιάσας, he seems to have been Apion's predecessor. From the tenor of the fragment it may be assumed that he was an Egyptian. According to Cosmas Indicopleustes, the work from which the fragment is taken is said to have been a "History of Egypt."⁴⁰ Since however Cosmas evidently derives his information only from Josephus, and erroneously reckons Apollonius Molon among the Αἰγυπτιακὰ συγγραψάμενοι, and nothing else is known of the Αἰγυπτιακά of Lysimachus, the matter must be left uncertain. Two works, Θηβαϊκὰ παράδοξα and Νόστοι (returns, reversiones, i.e. of Greek heroes from Troy), of an author named Lysimachus are frequently cited elsewhere in ancient literature. As the author of the Νόστοι seems to have been an Alexandrian and to have lived in the first century before Christ, he is probably identical with this Lysimachus.

⁴⁰ Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topograph. christ.* lib. xii. (by Gallandi, *Biblioth. Patr.* xi. 572): Οἱ δὲ τὰ Αἰγυπτιακὰ συγγραψάμενοι, τουτέστι Μανεθὼν καὶ Χαιρημῶν καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Μολῶν καὶ Λυσιμάχος καὶ Ἀπίων ὁ γραμματικὸς, μέμνηνται Μωϋσέως καὶ τῆς ἐξόδου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ τῆς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου.

The fragments of Lysimachus (both those from Josephus and those of the *Θηβαικὰ παράδοξα* and the *Νόστοι*) are collected in C. Müller, *Fragm. historicorum Graecorum*, iii. 334-342. The fragments of the *Θηβ. παράδ.* are also in Westermann, *Παράδοξογράφοι* (Brunsvigae 1839), p. xxx. sq., 164 sq. Comp. in general: Westermann in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iv. 1311. Stiehle, "Die Nosten des Lysimachos" (*Philologus*, vol. iv. 1849, pp. 99-110; v. 1850, p. 382 sq.). J. G. Müller, *Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion*, p. 208.

4. *Chaeremon* (comp. Josephus, *contra Apion.* i. 32-33). The fragment from Chaeremon also refers to the departure of the Jews from Egypt, and is with respect to its contents nearer to the narrative of Manetho than Lysimachus is. Josephus in this case expressly says, that the fragment was taken from the *Αἰγυπτιακὴ ἱστορία* of Chaeremon (*contra Apion.* i. 32) This Chaeremon is also elsewhere known as an author on Egyptian matters. In the letter of Porphyrius to the Egyptian Anebon, from which Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* iii. 4 and v. 10, gives extracts, two portions which relate to the Egyptian mythology and theology are cited from Chaeremon. In the second (Euseb. v. 10. 5, ed. Gaisford) Porphyrius designates Chaeremon as *ἱερογραμματεὺς*. In the work of Porphyrius, which has come down to us, *De abstinencia*, iv. 6-8, a detailed description of the life of Egyptian priests is given from Chaeremon, which Porphyry introduces with the words: "*Chaeremon the Stoic, in treating of the Egyptian priests who, as he says, are esteemed philosophers among the Egyptians, relates, that they chose the sanctuaries as the place for philosophizing (Τὰ γοῦν κατὰ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἱερέας Χαιρήμων ὁ Στωικὸς ἀφηγούμενος, οὗς καὶ φιλοσόφους ὑπειλήφθαί φησι παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις, ἐξηγεῖται ὡς τόπον μὲν ἐξελέξαντο ἐμφιλοσοφῆσαι τὰ ἱερά).* . . . Despising every other occupation and human pursuit, they devote their whole life to the contemplation of things divine," etc.⁴¹ At the end

⁴¹ The description does not refer to all Egyptian priests, but, as is declared at the conclusion (iv. 8), only to the *élite* among them, the *προφῆται*, *ἱεροστολισταί*, *ἱερογραμματεῖς* and *ὠρολόγοι*. Hieronymus, *adv. Jovinian.* ii. 13 borrows the description from Porphyrius (Vallarsii, ii. 342 sq.).

of this account Porphyrius calls Chaeremon a truth-loving, trustworthy and intelligent Stoic philosopher (iv. 8, *fin.*: ἀνδρὸς φιλαλήθους τε καὶ ἀκριβοῦς ἐν τε τοῖς Στωικοῖς πραγματώτατα φιλοσοφήσαντος). All these portions may well have stood in an "Egyptian History." From it are also derived the communications from Chaeremon in a treatise of Psellus published by Sathas (1877). The same Chaeremon also wrote a work which is taken up in explaining the hieroglyphics (διδάγματα τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων). From this the Byzantine Tzetzes has given extracts in his historical work (v. 403 in Müller, *Fragm.* iii. 499) and in his commentary on the *Iliad* (ed. Gottfr. Hermann, 1812, pp. 123 and 146). Tzetzes also designates Chaeremon as ἱερογραμματεὺς and says, that according to Chaeremon's view "the φυσικὸς λόγος concerning the gods, their physical signification is allegorically exhibited in the hieroglyphics" (Zeller). This also characterizes Chaeremon as a Stoic. Hence there can be no doubt that he is identical with our ἱερογραμματεὺς, who in a few other citations (*e.g.* in Origen's *contra Celsum*, l. 59. Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 19. 8) is simply called Στωικός. He is on this account a very remarkable personage for his age: an *Egyptian priest and at the same time a Stoic philosopher*. Since he was, according to Suidas, the instructor of Nero (Suidas' *Lex. s.v.* Ἀλέξανδρος Αἰγαῖος), and also the instructor and predecessor of Dionysius of Alexandria, who lived from Nero to Trajan (Suidas' *Lex. s.v.* Διονύσιος Ἀλεξανδρεὺς), he must have lived towards the middle of the first century after Christ. He was, according to Suidas, the predecessor of Dionysius in the office of *librarian at Alexandria*. He cannot, by reason of the chronology stated, be identical with the Chaeremon who is mentioned by Strabo (xvii. 1. 29, p. 806) as a contemporary of Aelius Gallus. Besides the latter has been described as a man, who made himself ridiculous by his ostentation and ignorance, which are certainly not characteristics of a philosopher.

The fragments of Chaeremon are collected in C. Müller, *Frag. hist. graec.* iii. 495-499. To these are to be added: (1) the extracts given in Tzetzes, *Draconis Stratonicensis liber de metris poeticis et Joannis Tzetzæ exegesis in Homeri Iliadem*, 1st ed. Godofr. Hermannus, Lips. 1812, pp. 123 and 146; and (2) those in the treatise of Psellus, published by Sathas (*Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, vol. i. 1877, pp. 121-133, 194-208, 309-314). Comp. in general: Bähr in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* ii. 298 sq. Birch, "On the lost book of Chaeremon on Hieroglyphics" (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, second series, vol. iii. 1850, pp. 385-396). Bernays, *Theophrastos' Schrift über die Frömmigkeit* (1866), pp. 21 sq., 150 sq. Zeller, "Die Hieroglyphiker Chäremón und Horapollon" (*Hermes*, vol. xi. 1876, pp. 430-433). Nicolai, *Griechische Literaturgesch.* 2nd ed. ii. 559, 561, 677, 690, iii. 383. J. G. Müller, *Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion* (1877), p. 203 sqq.

5. *Apion* (comp. Josephus, *contra Apion.* ii. 1-13). Apion the grammarian, who was distinguished among all the opponents of the Jews for his special malevolence, and was therefore treated with special harshness by Josephus, was a contemporary and fellow-countryman of Chaeremon. His full name was *Ἀπίων ὁ Πλειστονίκης*.⁴³ According to Suidas, *Πλειστονίκης* was the name of his father (*Lex. s.v. Ἀπίων ὁ Πλειστονίκου*), which he afterwards took as a surname. When Julius Africanus (in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 10. 16, ed. Gaisford; and in Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 120 and 281) and after him the pseudo-Justinian, *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, c. 9, call the name of the father *Ποσειδώνιος*, this is certainly but a corruption of *Πλειστονίκης*. According to Josephus (*contra Apion.* ii. 3), Apion was born in the oasis of Egypt, and hence was not, as he gave himself out to be, a native of Alexandria. He afterwards however received the rights of Alexandrian citizenship (*Jos. l.c.*), and acquired some fame in Alexandria as a grammarian. He taught temporarily in Rome also in the

⁴³ Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 101 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 12. 2): *Ἀπίων τοίνυν ὁ γραμματικὸς ὁ Πλειστονίκης ἐπικληθεὶς*. Clem. Rom. *Homil.* iv. 6: *Ἀπίωνα τὸν Πλειστονίκην ἄνδρα Ἀλεξανδρέα, γραμματικὸν τὴν ἐπιστήμην*. Plinius, *Hist. Nat.* xxxvii. 5. 75: *Apion cognominatus Plistonices*. Gellius, *Noct. Att.* v. 14: *Apion qui Plistonices appellatus est*. *Ibid.* vi. 8: *Ἀπίων, Graecus homo, qui Πλειστονίκης est appellatus*.

time of Tiberius and Claudius (Suidas, *Lex. s.v. 'Απίων*). In the reign of Caligula he travelled through Greece as an itinerant orator delivering lectures on Homer (Seneca, *epist.* 88). It was also under Caligula, that, on the occasion of the sanguinary conflict of the Alexandrians with the Jews, he came to Rome as the ambassador of the former (Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 8. 1). According to Josephus (*contra Apion.* ii. 3), his death was caused by ulcers in the genitals, against which circumcision was of no avail. He is described as having been ridiculously vain. Tiberius called him *cymbalum mundi*. He himself said, without embarrassment, that those to whom he addressed a work became thereby immortal,⁴³ and congratulated Alexandria on having such a citizen as he was (Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 12).

The works of Apion were manifold. The best known seem to have been his works on Homer (*Commentaries and a Dictionary*). We are here only concerned with his Egyptian History (*Αἰγυπτιακά*), which according to Tatian comprised five books, of which Josephus cites the third, Tatian and his successors the fourth, and Gellius the fifth book.⁴⁴ *This Egyptian History evidently contained all those attacks upon the Jews to which the reply of Josephus refers (c. Apion. ii. 1–3).* Josephus says, at the beginning of his discussion, that it was not easy to go through the discourse (τὸν λόγον) of Apion, because he brought forth all in the greatest disorder. But that about three points might be distinguished: (1) the fables

⁴³ Plinius, *Hist. Nat. praef.* § 25: Apion quidam grammaticus (hic quem Tiberius Caesar cymbalum mundi vocabat, cum propriae famae tympanum potius videri posset) immortalitate donari a se scripsit ad quos aliqua conponebat.

⁴⁴ Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 2: Φησὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν. Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, c. 38 (= Euseb. *Praep. ev.* x. 11. 14): 'Απίων ὁ γραμματικὸς, ἀνὴρ δοκιμώτατος, ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν (πέντε δὲ εἰσὶν αὐτῷ γραφαί) κ.τ.λ. In agreement herewith Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 101 = Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 12. 2. Julius Africanus in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 10. 16, and in Syncell. ed. Dindorf, i. 120 and 281. Pseudo-Justin. *Cohortat. ad Graec.* c. 9. Gellius, *Noct. Att.* v. 14: Apion . . . in libro Aegyptiacorum quinto scripsit.

concerning the departure of the Jews from Egypt, (2) the malicious assertions concerning the Alexandrian Jews, and (3) the accusations in respect of worship and legal customs. Of the latter, Josephus says, that they are mixed up with the accusations of the first two categories (ἐπὶ τούτοις μέμικται, ii. 1, *fin.*). Thus it appears that a single λόγος of Apion, containing all these accusations, and divided by Josephus for the sake of order into three categories, was in question. Josephus, after entering successively into all three categories (*c. Apion.* ii. 2-3 relates to the first, ii. 4-6 to the second, ii. 7-13 to the third), leaves Apion and begins to give a positive delineation of the Mosaic legislation. At its commencement he once more touches incidentally upon Apion, and says of him that he has heaped his indictments all together (ii. 14: τὴν κατηγορίαν . . . ἀθρόαν . . . ἔταξεν), in distinction from Apollonius Molon, whose polemic pervades his whole work. There can therefore be no doubt that the polemic of Josephus refers to only *one* work of Apion's, and indeed to only one section of a larger work. This work was, as Josephus expressly says in the beginning of his discussion (ii. 2), the Egyptian History. In it Apion apparently took occasion, in narrating the departure of the Jews from Egypt, to give a hostile description of them, in like manner as Tacitus does in his Histories (*Hist.* v. 1-12). When consequently Clemens Alexandrinus and later Church authors mention a special work of Apion, κατὰ Ἰουδαίων, this rests only upon a mistaken inference from the information of Josephus. It is just the silence of Josephus which proves that no such work ever existed. That these Church authors also had no actual acquaintance with it, is made evident by a more accurate comparison of the text. For Clemens Alexandrinus, in the passage where he mentions it, is in fact only copying from Tatian, who on his part is only quoting Apion's Egyptian History. And all subsequent writers, who pretend to know anything of a work of Apion κατὰ Ἰουδαίων, obtain their information from either Clement or Josephus.

Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, c. 38 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 11. 14, ed. Gaisford): Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Ἀπίων ὁ γραμματικὸς, ἀνὴρ δοκιμώτατος, ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν (πέντε δὲ εἰσὶν αὐτῷ γραφαί) πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα, φησὶ δὲ ὅτι· Κατέσκαψε τὴν Αὔαριν Ἀμώσις κατὰ τὸν Ἀργεῖον γενόμενος Ἰναχον, ὡς ἐν τοῖς Χρόνοις ἀνέγραψεν ὁ Μενδήσιος Πτολεμαῖος.

Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 101 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 12. 2, ed. Gaisford): Ἀπίων τοίνυν ὁ γραμματικὸς ὁ Πλειστονίκης ἐπικληθεὶς ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν ἱστοριῶν, καίτοι φιλαπεχ-
θημόνως πρὸς Ἑβραίους διακείμενος, ἅτε Αἰγύπτιος τὸ γένος, ὡς καὶ κατὰ Ἰουδαίων συνπάξασθαι βιβλίον, Ἀμώσιος τοῦ Αἰγυπτίων βασιλέως μεμνημένος καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν πράξεων μάρτυρα παρατίθεται Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Μενδήσιον, καὶ τὰ τῆς λέξεως αὐτοῦ ὧδε ἔχει· "Κατέσκαψε δὲ τὴν κ.τ.λ." (here follows verbally the same quotation as in Tatian, whom Clemens had just before expressly quoted).

Julius Africanus in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 10. 16, and in Syncell. ed. Dindorf, i. 120 and 281: Ἀπίων δὲ ὁ Ποσειδωνίου περιεργότατος γραμματικῶν, ἐν τῇ κατὰ Ἰουδαίων βίβλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν ἱστοριῶν φησὶ, κατὰ, Ἰναχον Ἀργεὺς βασιλέα, Ἀμώσιος Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεύοντος, ἀποστῆναι Ἰουδαίους, ὧν ἡγεῖσθαι Μωσέα.

Pseudo-Justin. *Cohortatio ad Graec.* c. 9: Οὕτω γὰρ Πολέμων τε ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἱστοριῶν μέμνηται καὶ Ἀππίων ὁ Ποσειδωνίου ἐν τῇ κατὰ Ἰουδαίων βίβλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν ἱστοριῶν, λέγων κατὰ Ἰναχον Ἀργεὺς βασιλέα Ἀμώσιδος Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεύοντος ἀποστῆναι Ἰουδαίους, ὧν ἡγεῖσθαι Μωϋσέα. Καὶ Πτολεμαῖος δὲ ὁ Μενδήσιος, τὰ Αἰγυπτίων ἱστοριῶν, ἅπασι τούτοις συντρέχει.

The mention of Apion's supposed work κατὰ Ἰουδαίων was first introduced in this connection by means of Clement. But Clement only says that Apion wrote such a work; for the rest he simply quotes, as Tatian does, Apion's Egyptian History as his authority for the statement that Amosis reigned in the time of Inachus. Julius Africanus, on the contrary, now ventures to assert, on the foundation of the passage of Clement, that this statement was found in both the supposed works of Apion, and at the same time drags in Moses also, who is not even spoken of in the passage quoted from Apion. Finally the author of the *Cohortatio* again copies only from Julius Africanus. This latter fact I have, I think, proved in Brieger's *Zeitschrift für Kirchengesch.* ii. (1878) pp. 319-331. Comp. also Donaldson, *History of Christian Literature*, ii. 96 sqq. Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. i. Nos. 1, 2, 1882, p. 157. Neumann, *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1883, p. 582. Renan, *Marc-Aurèle*, 1882, p. 107, note. The dependence of the *Cohortatio* upon the text to which Julius Africanus had access is at any rate indubitable. Hence Gutschmid, starting from the mistaken assumption that the *Cohortatio* was more ancient than Julius Africanus, supposed that both had a common source (*Jahrb. für class. Philologie*,

1860, pp. 703–708). Some moderns also acquiesce in this view, more through faith in Gutschmid than on sufficient grounds. So Völter, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1883, p. 180 sqq. Dräseke, *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.* vol. vii. p. 257 sqq.

Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* iii. 9. 4, in enumerating the works of Josephus, says that his work, *Ueber das hohe Alter der Juden* (i.e. *contra Apion.*), was written “against Apion the grammarian,” who had then composed a λόγος against the Jews (πρὸς Ἀπίωνα τὸν γραμματικὸν κατὰ Ἰουδαίων τηλικάδε συντάξαντα λόγον). Evidently this is only inferred from Josephus. The same applies also to Hieronymus, *De viris illustr.* c. 13 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ii. 851): adversum Appionem grammaticum Alexandrinum, qui sub Caligula legatus missus ex parte gentilium contra Philonem etiam librum, vituperationem gentis Judicae continentem, scripserat. The account of Eusebius, which Jerome, as his custom is, copies, is here only enlarged by the combination that Apion’s book was directed *against Philo*. This combination is founded on Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 8. 1. From the Greek translation of Jerome (Sophronius) again arise the statements in Suidas, *Lex. s.v.* Ἰώσηπος. When it is at last said in the *Clementine Homilies*, that Apion wrote πολλά βιβλία against the Jews, this statement must of course not be taken seriously.

Comp. on Apion in general: Burigny, “Mémoire sur Apion” (*Mémoires de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, ancient series, vol. xxxviii. 1777, pp. 171–178). Lehrs, “Quid Apio Homero praestiterit” (*Quaestiones Epicae*, 1837, pp. 1–34). Cruice, *De Flavii Josephi in auctoribus contra Apionem offerendis fide et auctoritate* (Paris 1844), p. 9. Schliemann, *Die Clementinen* (1844), p. 111 sqq. C. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iii. 506–516. Volkmann in Pauly’s *Real-Enc.* i. 1 (2nd ed.), p. 1243 sq. Creuzer, *Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1853, p. 80 sq. Paret, *Des Flavii Josephus Werke übersetzt*, 7 vols. (1856), pp. 741–745. Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 2nd ed. ii. 187–195. Nicolai, *Griech. Literaturgesch.* 2nd ed. ii. 345–347. J. G. Müller, *Des Fl. Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion* (1877), pp. 14–17. Lightfoot, art. “Apion” in Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, i. 128–130.

6. The literary opponents of the Jews hitherto mentioned have been here treated of more thoroughly, because the polemic of Josephus is directed chiefly against them. An exhaustive enumeration of all the Greek and Roman authors, who from the beginning of the second century after Christ expressed themselves in a hostile manner against the Jews, would furnish a list of distinguished names. Almost all the

authors who have to speak of the Jews at all do so in a hostile manner. Among pre-Christian *Greek* authors Josephus chiefly names the distinguished historian and philosopher Posidonius as an adversary of the Jews (*c. Apion.* ii. 7). In his great historical work (see on it Div. i. vol. i. § 3) he probably somewhere seized the opportunity of giving a polemical excursus against the Jews, and afterwards many subsequent writers, as Diodorus (xxxiv. 1) and Trogus Pompeius, who comes down to us through the extract of Justin (xxxvi. 2, 3),⁴⁵ drew either directly or indirectly from his much read work. The works too of Nikarchus (Müller, *Fragm.* iii. 335) and Damokritus (Müller, *Fragm.* iv. 377), which are scarcely known by name, were also polemical. Of *Roman* historians, besides Trogus Pompeius already mentioned, prominence must be given to Tacitus, whose description of the Jews (*Hist.* v. 2 sqq.) is dictated by the most profound contempt. The Roman satirists Horace, Juvenal, and Martial have also notably made the Jews the butt of their wit.

2. *Apologetic.*

Jewish Apologetic followed a twofold way of defence, a direct and an indirect one, against the many attacks which Judaism had to undergo. A large portion of the historic and philosophic literature of Hellenistic Judaism is of an indirectly apologetic character; it seeks to show that the Jewish nation need in no respect shrink from a comparison with other nations. But this was not thought enough; the attempt was also sometimes made to refute point after point in a systematic manner the accusations raised against the Jews. Two of such systematically apologetic works are known to us, one (that of Philo) only by a short fragment, the other (that of Josephus) in the complete text. (1) Eusebius gives in the *Praep. evang.* viii. 11

⁴⁵ Comp. on Posidonius as the source of subsequent writers the article of J. G. Müller, *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1843, p. 893 sqq., and his commentary on Joseph. *c. Apion.* (1877) pp. 214 sqq. and 258 sq.

the description of the Essenes from Philo's ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων. From this however we can form no idea of its whole design. The work of Philo περὶ Ἰουδαίων, mentioned in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 18. 6, is certainly identical with it. (2) The work of Josephus, to be mentioned in this connection, is known to us by the title of *contra Apion*. This title, which did not originate with Josephus himself, gives an erroneous idea of its contents. For it is by no means occupied with Apion alone, but undertakes a comprehensive and systematic defence of the Jewish people against all the accusations raised against them (further particulars, Div. i. vol. i. § 3).

In endeavouring in what follows to give a sketch of *the main substance of the indictment and defence*, we must chiefly restrict ourselves to the material afforded by Josephus, his work being the only one handed down to us, which both contains a survey of the points of accusation and furnishes a view of the method of apologetic demonstration. The *disposition* of the Graeco-Roman world towards the Jews has been already described (Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 291). Here only the actual accusations and the Jewish answer to them will be brought forward.

1. Extensive and learned matter is furnished by Josephus in the first section (i. 1–23) to prove, that *the Jewish nation was not inferior in point of antiquity to other cultured nations*. He says, that to maintain, that it is of recent origin because the Greek historians say nothing of it, is foolish, even if the assumption were correct. For even the silence of all the Greek historians would prove nothing against the early existence of the nation, since the Jews, as dwelling in an inland country, might easily remain unknown to the Greeks. In truth however *the Jewish nation was already known in very ancient times by the best historians of the Egyptians, Phoenicians, Chaldaeans* (Manetho, Dios, Menander, Berosus, and others), *nay even by Greek historians themselves*. The zeal which Josephus exhibits, and the large amount of matter he brings forward, show how important this point was in his

eyes. The assertion of modern origin was equivalent to the assertion of historical insignificance. A nation, which had but recently appeared upon the stage of history, had of course also no importance in history. It received its culture from the more ancient nations. But this was to strike at the roots of Jewish honour, and hence the Jewish apologist regarded it as his first duty thoroughly to repel such an insult.⁴⁶

2. While the Greeks in general were satisfied with denying the high antiquity of the Jewish nation, the Alexandrians related very unfair things concerning the *origin of the Jews*. The quintessence of their fictions was, that the Jews were leprous Egyptians, who succeeded in a very dishonourable manner in forming themselves into a separate nation, in leaving Egypt and settling in Palestine.⁴⁷ Josephus felt himself master of the situation in opposing these fables. With dignified superiority he pointed out to the Alexandrians the absurdity and the internal discrepancy of their assertions (i. 24-35, ii. 1-3).

3. With the imputation of recentness of origin was connected the assertion, that the Jews had *done nothing for culture*. Apollonius Molon said, that they were the most incapable of barbarians and had therefore contributed no useful invention to general culture (*contra Apion*. ii. 14: ἀφυστάτους εἶναι τῶν βαρβάρων καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μηδὲν εἰς τὸν βίον εὖρημα συμβεβλησθαι μόνους). Apion said, that they had produced no eminent men, such as inventors of arts or men distinguished for wisdom (*contra Apion*. ii. 12: θαυμαστοὺς ἄνδρας οὐ παρ᾽ ἐχρήκαμεν, οἶον τεχνῶν τινῶν εὖρετὰς ἢ σοφίᾳ διαφέροντας). These reproaches were encountered with the older Jewish

⁴⁶ On the motive for the proof of antiquity, see *contra Apion*. ii. 15. It is well known, that Christian apologists also lay great stress upon it. See Tatian, c. xxxi. 36-41. Theophilus, *ad Autol.* iii. 20 sqq. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* i. 21. 101-147. Tertullian, *Apolog.* 19. Pseudo-Justin, *Cohort. ad Graec.* c. 9. Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* x. 9 sqq. And more in Semisch, *Justin*, i. 134.

⁴⁷ So with much variation of detail: Manetho (*contra Apion*. i. 26), Lysimachus (i. 34), Chäremón (i. 32), Apion (ii. 2). Also Justin, xxxvi. 2, and Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 3. Comp. also Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 250.

legend, that *the Jews were on the contrary the originators of all culture*. According to Eupolemus, Moses was the first sage, the inventor of alphabetic writing (see above, p. 203). According to Artapanus, Abraham instructed the Egyptians in astrology, Joseph undertook the improved cultivation of the land, and Moses introduced culture of every kind (p. 206). The philosopher Aristobulus already declares Moses to be the father of Greek philosophy, and that Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato and the rest all derived their philosophy from him (p. 240 sq.). The same assertion is repeated by Philo, and Josephus takes just the same tone though making no use in his *Apology* of the legends of Eupolemus and Artapanus. He lays the chief stress upon proving besides the high antiquity, the wisdom and excellence of the Mosaic legislation.

4. The special accusations against Judaism were above all in respect of its *religious worship*, which was always connected with the refusal to acknowledge any other worship as legitimate. This last was in the era of heathenism a thing unheard of. "To live and let live" was the motto in the province of religion. The most opposite kinds of religious worship were readily tolerated, if only the adherents of one cultus would hold others legitimate. Especially was it taken for granted as a thing self-evident, that the citizens of the same town should, besides any private worship of their own, participate in honouring the gods of the town. What an abnormity then must it have been felt, that the Jews should entirely reject every kind of worship except their own, and absolutely refuse to take part in any other! From the standpoint of Hellenism this was *synonymous with Atheism*. If they are citizens, why do they not worship the gods of the city? This accusation of ἀθεότης, of contempt for the gods recurs in almost all adversaries of the Jews, from Apollonius Molon and Posidonius to Pliny and Tacitus;⁴⁸ and from it

⁴⁸ Apion in Joseph. *contra Apion*. ii. 6: quomodo ergo, inquit, si sunt cives, eosdem deos, quos Alexandrini, non colunt? Posidonius and Apollonius Molon, *ibid.* ii. 7: accusant quidem nos, quare nos eosdem deos

certainly arose in great part the conflicts of municipalities with the Jews, especially in the towns where they possessed rights of citizenship. It was easy in theory but difficult in practice, for apologetic to hold its ground in presence of this accusation. With an educated reader it was not very difficult to make manifest the advantages of the monotheistic and spiritual view of the nature of God, especially as Greek philosophy offered an abundance of thoughts, which came in this respect to the aid of Jewish apologists. In this sense does Josephus proceed, simply exhibiting the Jewish idea of God in its superiority (*contra Apion*. ii. 22). In practice however the masses were not to be influenced by such considerations. For the reproach still adhered to the Jews, that they absolutely rejected what others regarded as the worship of God. Hence the chief weapon of Jewish apologetic upon this point was a vigorous attack. When the Jews were reproached for despising the gods, they showed on their part what kind of gods they were, whom others honoured; weak images of wood, stone, silver, or gold, the work of men's hands, or animals of every kind, or at best beings, who were affected with manifold human weaknesses. The Jews might well feel themselves superior to the worshippers of such gods (comp. e.g. pseudo-Aristeas in Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 116. *Sap. Salomonis*, c. 13-15. *The Epistle of Jeremiah*, Joseph. *contra Apion*. ii. 33-35, and especially the *Sibyllines*).

Of less practical importance than the charge of ἀθεότης were certain ridiculous fables which were related concerning the Jewish worship; that they paid divine honours to an *ass's head*, and that they annually *sacrificed a Greek* and fed upon his entrails (see above, § 31, notes 239, 240, 250). Such fables were indeed believed only in small circles, and Josephus very easily proves their absurdity (*contra Apion*. ii. 7-9).

5. Of greater weight, on the other hand, was another

cum aliis non colimus. Apollonius Molon, *ibid.* ii. 14: ὡς ἀθίους .
λαιδόρεϊ. Plinius, *H. N.* xiii. 4. 46: gens contumelia numinum insignis
Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5: contemnere deos.

point connected with the *ἀθεΐα* of the Jews, viz. their refusal of *the worship of the emperor*. Subsequently to Augustus all the provinces emulated each other in the practice of this cult (see Div. ii. vol. i. p. 16 sq.). Zeal for this was the standard of a loyal and Rome-loving disposition, its entire rejection was synonymous with not showing due respect to the authorities. Such was at least the view of the Hellenistic population, who, according to the customs of the Hellenistic period, freely offered their worship to the emperor. The Jews were in a favourable position in this respect, inasmuch as the emperors of the first centuries, with the sole exception of Caligula, did not directly demand this worship. Nor, apart from the short episode under Caligula, was it ever required of the Jews, whose mode of worship received legal protection, together with the legal recognition of their communities from Caesar onwards (see above, Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 265). For the adversaries of the Jews, however, it was always a welcome point of attack, that they proved themselves bad citizens by their refusal of worship to the emperor.⁴⁹ Jewish apologists could, in answer to this charge, appeal to the fact, that ■ sacrifice was daily offered for the emperor in the temple at Jerusalem (Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 6, *fin.*; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 10. 4; comp. Div. ii. vol. i. p. 302), and that on special occasions even hecatombs were offered for the Roman emperor (Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* § 45, Mang. ii. 598). Thus, in fact, was ■ certain equivalent furnished for that worship of the emperor which was impossible to Jews. Josephus, besides, does not neglect pointing on every occasion to the favour which the Jews enjoyed both from the Ptolemies and from Caesar (*c. Apion.* ii. 4, 5; *Antt.* xiv. 10, xvi. 6). This surely would have been impossible unless they had been loyal citizens!

6. With this religious isolation was connected a certain amount of *social isolation*. Judaism expressly repudiated the

⁴⁹ Apion in Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 6, *med.*: *derogare nobis Apion voluit, quia imperatorum non statuamus imagines. Tacitus, Hist. v. 5: non regibus haec adulatio, non Caesaribus honor.*

idea, now more and more making its way in Hellenism, that all men are brethren, and therefore equal before God. It saw in the unbeliever only the sinner, who has incurred the judgment of God, and referred the fatherly love of God only to the seed of Abraham, on which account only the children of Abraham are brethren to each other. If this particularism was not held in its full rigour by philosophic and Hellenistic Judaism in general, it gained on the other hand a support from the view, that the heathen as such were unclean, that in the interest of Levitical purity intercourse with them was as far as possible to be avoided, and from the anxiety with which contact with everything that stood in any kind of relation to idolatry was abhorred (comp. Div. ii. vol. i. pp. 51–56). *If, then, the Jew was already directed in theory to regard the non-Jew as only an "alien," it was also impossible to him in practice, if he desired to observe the law, to live in any close social intercourse with the heathen.* This theoretical and practical ἀμιξία, which was in opposition to the entire tendency of the Hellenistic period, was constantly and very specially made a reproach against the Jews. To the Greeks and Romans, who were unacquainted with its deeper motives, it appeared only as a want of humanity, of true philanthropy, nay as criminal misanthropy. And it may indeed not infrequently have really manifested itself in such forms.⁵⁰ The process adopted in this respect by apologetic writers was on the one hand chiefly that

⁵⁰ The councillors of Antiochus Sidetes already pointed to the ἀμιξία of the Jews (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 8. 3, and Diodor. xxxiv. 1, probably after Posidonius). Justinus, xxxvi. 2. 15: caverunt, ne cum peregrinis conviverent. Apollonius Molon in Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 14: ὡς . . . μισανθρώπους λοιδορεῖ. *Ibid.* ii. 36: ὁ Μόλων Ἀπολλώνιος ἡμῶν κατηγορήσεν ὅτι μὴ παραδεχόμεθα τοὺς ἄλλοις προκατελιγμένους δόξαις περὶ θεοῦ, μηδὲ κοινωνεῖν ἐθέλομεν τοῖς καθ' ἑτέραν συνήθειαν βίου ζῆν προαιρουμένοις. Lysimachus asserted (Joseph. *c. Apion.* i. 34), that Moses had directed the Jews: μήτε ἀνθρώπων τινὶ εὐνοήσῃν, etc. According to Apion (Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 8), the Jews were accustomed, at the annual sacrifice of a Greek, to swear, ut inimicitias contra Graecos haberent, or, as it is said, ii. 10: μεδενὶ εὐνοήσῃν ἄλλοφύλῳ μάλιστα δὲ Ἕλλησιν Tacit. *Hist.* v. 5: adversus omnes alios hostile odium: separati epulis, discreti cubilibus . . . alienarum concubita abstinent. Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv 103–104 (see Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 295).

of pointing to the humane appointments of the law, especially with regard to strangers (Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 28–29), and on the other that of showing, how the ancient laws of other States went much farther in the exclusion of strangers than the Mosaic law did (*c. Apion.* ii. 36–37).

7. The peculiarities of the Jews *already mentioned*, viz. their ἀθεότης and their ἀμιξία, are those which came forward the most prominently in public life. It was on this account that the Jews appeared to be the enemies of such public regulations and institutions as had then been formed, nay as the opponents of all other human intercourse. Hence it is on these points that attacks are most seriously directed. Other peculiarities gave occasion rather to derision and contempt than to actual accusations. Among these were (a) *circumcision*, (b) *abstinence from swine's flesh*, and (c) *the observance of the Sabbath*.⁵¹ Even the most malicious of their other opponents did not venture upon the reproach of that special immorality to which Tacitus alludes.⁵² Apologetic writers oppose to the derision shown towards these several peculiarities an *ideal picture of the entire Mosaic code*. As Philo by his idealistic representation of the Mosaic legislation (see above, p. 219 sq.) already gave an indirect apology for it, so also does Josephus endeavour, by a connected and positive statement, to show, that the precepts of the Mosaic law are in every respect the purest and most ideal (*c. Apion.* ii. 22–30). In doing this he does not enter into these objectionable points, but contents himself with referring his opponent, the Egyptian Apion, to the fact, that the Egyptian priests also were circumcised and abstained from swine's flesh (*Ap.* ii. 13). To show the value and excellency of the law, he points out in general its high antiquity (ii. 15), the blameless character of

⁵¹ *Circumcision*: Apion in Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 13, *init.* Horace, *Sat.* i. 9. 69 sq. *Swine's flesh*: Apion in Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 13, *init.* Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 160, xiv. 98. *Observance of the Sabbath*: Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv. 105–106. Tacit. *Hist.* v. 4.

⁵² Tacit. *Hist.* v. 5. projectissima ad libidinem gens . . . inter se nihil illicitum.

Moses the lawgiver, and also the fact that this law really fulfilled its object, being known and obeyed by all, which astonishing result arose from its being not only taught but practised (ii. 16-19). Finally, Josephus brings forward the circumstance, that no Jew is ever unfaithful to his law, which is again a proof of its excellence (ii. 31-32, 38). The deficiencies found in this treatise, inasmuch as it does not further enter into those points which were objected to by the heathen, are abundantly compensated for by Philo, who in his special delineation of the Mosaic law treats all these points very thoroughly, and everywhere proves their reasonableness.⁵³

VII. JEWISH PROPAGANDA UNDER A HEATHEN MASK.

At the close of our survey, we have still to discuss a class of literary productions highly characteristic of Hellenistic Judaism, viz. *Jewish works under a heathen mask*. The works which belong to this category, differ greatly so far as their literary form is concerned, but have all the common feature of appearing under the name of some heathen authority, whether of a mythological authority, as the sibyl, or of persons eminent in history, as Hecataeus and Aristaeas. The very choice of this pseudonymic form shows, that *all these works were calculated for heathen readers, and designed for the propagation of Judaism among the heathen*. For only with heathen readers were such names a standard authority, and only on their account could this form have been chosen by Jewish authors. Hence the tendency, which is peculiar to a large portion of the Graeco-Jewish literature in general, viz. the tendency to influence non-Jewish readers, here obtains significant expression. In one respect or another its intention was to carry on

⁵³ On *Circumcision*: *de circumcissione* = *Opp.* ed. Mang. ii. 210-212. *Sabbath observance*: *de septenario*, § 6-7 = Mang. ii. 281-284. *Prohibition of unclean animals*: *de concupiscentia*, § 4-9 = Mang. ii. 352-355. On the observance of the Sabbath, compare also Aristobulus in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 12. 9-16, on unclean animals, pseudo-Aristaeas in *Havercamp's Josephus*, ii. 2. 117.

among the heathen a propaganda for Judaism. The special design however certainly differed in different cases. The Sibyllines desire to effect a propaganda properly so called. They set forth directly before the heathen world the folly of idolatry and the depravity of its moral conduct; they threaten punishment and ruin in case of impenitence, and promise reward and eternal happiness in case of conversion, and they thus seek to win adherents to the Jewish faith in the midst of the heathen world. An effect however of quite a different kind is aimed at in other works of this category; their purpose is not so much to propagate the faith as the honour and credit of the Jews. Thus, pseudo-Aristeas *e.g.* seeks, in his whole narrative of the translation of the Jewish law into Greek, to show what a high opinion was entertained by the learned Ptolemy II. of this law and of Jewish wisdom in general, and with what great honour he treated Jewish scholars. A directly missionary purpose does not come forward in this author; he cares more to *create a favourable disposition* towards Judaism and the Jewish law. And thus throughout this category, now one, now the other purpose comes more into the foreground—at one time that of winning believers, at another, that of creating a favourable impression. Still in one way or the other and in the wider meaning all subserve the propagation of Judaism. And since they all make choice of a heathen mask for this purpose, they all belong, however much they may differ otherwise in form and contents, to one category.

We begin our discussion with the Sibylline oracles, not because these are the oldest works of this class, but because they are the most important both with respect to extent and actual effect.

1. *The Sibyllines.*

The sibyl was in heathen antiquity “the semi-divine prophetess of the orders and counsels of the gods concerning

the fate of cities and kingdoms" (Lücke).⁵⁴ She was distinguished from the official priestly order of prophets by representing a free and non-official prophetic power, being indeed first of all a personification of the Deity as revealing itself in nature. She is represented as a nymph dwelling by streams and grottoes. The most ancient authors speak only of a sibyl; so Heraclitus, who is the first to mention one at all (in Plutarch, *de Pythiae oraculis*, c. 6); so also Euripides, Aristophanes, Plato.⁵⁵ The fact, that her voice was said to have been perceived in different places, then led to the supposition, that she wandered from place to place.⁵⁶ At last this was not found sufficient, and different sibyls said to dwell in different places were distinguished. Their number is very differently stated. There are learned combinations, which have been made now in one manner, now in another.⁵⁷ The statement of Pausanias (*Descr. Graec.* x. 12), who distinguishes four sibyls, is worthy of notice. These are: (1) The Herophile who came from Marpessus in the region of Troy, prophesied in various parts of Asia Minor and Greece and was falsely stated by the Erythraeans to have been an Erythraean; (2) a more ancient one, probably the Libyan (Maass, p. 7), but whose abode, in consequence of a gap in the text of Pausanias, cannot be determined; (3) the Cumanian; and (4) the Hebrew, who is also called the Babylonian or Egyptian.

⁵⁴ The most important material concerning the sibyls was already collected by Opsopöus in his edition of the *Orac. Sibyll.* pp. 56-143. For more recent authorities, comp. especially: Klausen, *Aeneas und die Penaten* (1839), pp. 208-312. Lücke, *Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes* (2nd ed.), p. 81 sqq. Alexandre in his 1st ed. vol. ii. (1856) pp. 1-101. Scheiffele, art. "Sibyllae," in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* vi. 1147-1153. Pape-Benseler, *Wörterb. der griech. Eigennamen*, s.v. Σίβυλλα. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. iii. (1878) p. 336 sqq. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la divination*, vol. ii.; *Les sacerdoce divinatoires; devins, chresmologues, Sibylles; Oracles des dieux*, Paris 1879. Maass, *De Sibyllarum indicibus*, Diss. Gryphiswald 1879.

⁵⁵ Maass, *De Sibyllarum indicibus*, p. 1.

⁵⁶ E.g. Pausanias, *Descr. Graec.* x. 12.

⁵⁷ On the numerous calculations, see especially Maass, *De Sibyllarum indicibus*, 1879.

It seems as if Pausanias purposed thus to state the four chief kinds of sibyl: the Libyan as the most ancient, that of Greek, Asia Minor, the Roman and the Oriental. He expressly designates the latter as the most recent. It is highly probable, that the information relating to this subject is already a deposite of the Jewish sibyl fiction.⁵⁸ Among other computations, the most noted is that of Varro, who names ten sibyls.⁵⁹ In the Roman period the most famous were the Erythraean (from Erythraea on the Ionian coast, opposite the island of Chios) and the Cumanian (in Lower Italy).

Written records of supposed Sibylline oracles were here and there in circulation; but such remains of them as have come down to us through occasional quotations in authors such as Plutarch, Pausanias and others, are brief and scanty, and furnish no distinct notion of them.⁶⁰ In Asia Minor

⁵⁸ The words of Pausanias are as follows (*Descr. Graec.* x. 12. 9): *Ἐπετράφη δὲ καὶ ὕστερον τῆς Δημοῦς* [but there lived later than Demo] *παρὰ Ἑβραίοις τοῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς Παλαιστίνης γυνὴ χρησμολόγος, ὄνομα δὲ αὐτῇ Σάββη. Βηρώσσου δὲ εἶναι πατὴρ καὶ Ἑρμάνθης μητὴρ Φασὶ Σάββην· οἱ δὲ αὐτὴν Βαβυλωνίαν, ἔτεροι δὲ Σίβυλλαν καλοῦσιν Αἰγυπτίαν.*—Alexander Polyhistor being the first among Greek authors known to us, who quotes the Jewish sibyl (see below), we may perhaps conclude, that Pausanias derived his statements from Alexander (see Maass, pp. 12–22). From a similar source come also the statements concerning *Σαμβήθη* in Suidas, *Lex. s.v. Σίβυλλα* (*Σίβυλλα Καλδαία ἢ καὶ πρὸς τινῶν Ἑβραία ὀνομαζομένη, ἢ καὶ Περσίς, ἢ κυρίῳ ὀνόματι καλουμένη Σαμβήθη κ.τ.λ.*), and in the anonymous catalogues allied to Suidas, which mention *Σαμβήθη* (Maass, *De Sibyll. indic.* pp. 38, 42, 44). The designation of the sibyl as a daughter of Berossus is found also in pseudo-Justin, *Cohort. ad Graec.* c. 37. The Jewish sibyl identifies herself with the Erythraean, but says that she came from Babylon (*Sib. iii.* 808 sqq.). Clemens Alex. *Protrept.* vi. 70–71, calls her *προφήτις Ἑβραίων*. Comp. in general, Alexandre, ii. 82–87.

⁵⁹ Varro in Lactantius, *Div. Instit.* i. 6: *primam fuisse de Persis . . . secundam Libycam . . . tertiam Delphida . . . quartam Cimmeriam in Italia . . . quintam Erythraeam . . . sextam Samiam . . . septimam Cumanam . . . octavam Hellesponticam in agro Troiano natam vico Marmesso circa oppidum Gergitium . . . nonam Phrygiam . . . decimam Tiburtem.* See other computations, e.g. in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 108 and 132; Suidas, *Lex. s.v. Σίβυλλα* and others.

⁶⁰ See the collection in Alexandre's 1st ed. of the *Orac. Sibyll.* vol. ii. (1856) pp. 118–129. Some already in Opsopöus, in his edit. of the *Orac. Sibyll.* p. 414 sqq.

and Greece these pieces circulated only in private possession, without being publicly supervised or officially used. But their credit and influence must not be on that account slightly estimated.⁶¹ They attained quite a different importance in Rome, where they arrived by way of Cumae from Asia Minor.⁶² King Tarquin Superbus is said to have obtained a collection of Sibylline oracles, which were preserved in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.⁶³ These having perished in the conflagration of the Capitol, B.C. 83, the Senate, at the instigation of the consul C. Curio, sent an embassy, B.C. 76, to Asia Minor, which again made in Erythraea and other places a collection of about a thousand verses, which was again deposited in the Capitol.⁶⁴ The collection was afterwards occasionally enlarged and expurgated, and was in existence in the fourth century after Christ. Besides this official collection, Sibylline verses in private possession were also circulated, but these, by reason of the misuse made of them, were frequently confiscated and destroyed by the authorities. The official collection was kept secret, and only consulted on important occasions, chiefly to ascertain what expiations were required on the occurrence of public misfortunes.

This Sibyllism was from its very nature specially adapted for being turned to account in the interest of religious propaganda. The oracles, being of apocryphal origin, in private possession, and circulating without control, might be completed and added to at pleasure. What had been done in this respect by Greek hands might as easily be undertaken by Jewish. Besides the oracles, like the mysterious in general,

⁶¹ See on the Sibylline oracles among the Greeks, Alexandre as above, ii. 102-147.

⁶² See on the Sibylline oracles among the Romans, Opsopöus, pp. 462-496. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* i. 248-257. Alexandre in his 1st ed. ii. 148-253. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. iii. (1878) p. 336 sqq. Huidekoper, *Judaism at Rome* (New York 1876), pp. 395-459.

⁶³ Dionys. Halicarn. iv. 62.

⁶⁴ Lactant. i. 6. 14 (comp. i. 6. 11). Tacit. *Annal.* vi. 12. Dionys Halic. iv. 62.

enjoyed a high reputation among religiously disposed minds. It might then be hoped that entrance to extensive circles would be obtained under this form. Hence it was a happy hit when *Jewish propaganda took possession of this form to turn it to account for its own purposes*. As far as can be ascertained, it was in the second century before Christ that an extensive Sibylline oracle of Jewish origin was first put in circulation from Alexandria. The result seems to have been favourable, for imitators soon arose, at first among the Jews and subsequently among the Christians. For Christians were in this respect also the apt scholars of Hellenistic Judaism. They not only made willing use of the Jewish Sibylline oracles, and highly esteemed them, but also copiously increased what they found extant. Production in this department continued down to later imperial times, and it is just to the tradition of the Christian Church that we are indebted for the possession of the older Jewish Sibylline oracles also.

The first edition of the Judaeo-Christian Sibyllines (Basle 1545) which have come down to us was prepared by Xystus Betuleius after an Augsburg, now a Munich manuscript, and comprised *eight books*. The later editions show the same number down to and including that printed in Gallandi's *Bibliotheca patrum* (vol. i. Venice 1788). Angelo Mai was the first to publish from a Milan manuscript a *fourteenth* book (1817), and afterwards from two Vatican manuscript books *eleven to fourteen* (1828). All are combined in the modern editions of Alexandre (1st ed. in 2 vols. 1841–1856, 2nd ed. 1 vol. 1869) and Friedlieb (1852).

The form of these Judaeo-Christian Sibylline oracles is the same as that of the ancient heathen ones. The Jewish and Christian authors respectively make the ancient Sibyl speak to heathen nations in Greek hexameters, and in the language of Homer. The contents subserve throughout the purposes of religious propaganda. The Sibyl prophesies the fate of the world from the beginning to the times of the author, for the purpose of then uniting with it both threats and promises for

the immediate future ; she rebukes the heathen nations for the sinfulness of their idolatry and blasphemy, and exhorts them to repent while yet there is time, for that fearful judgments will fall upon the impenitent.

The collection *as we have it is a chaotic wilderness*, to sift and arrange which will ever baffle the most acute criticism. For unfortunately it is not the case, that each book forms of itself an original whole, but that even the single books are some of them arbitrary aggregates of single fragments. The curse of pseudonymous authorship seems to have prevailed very specially over these oracles. Every reader and writer allowed himself to complete what existed after his own pleasure, and to arrange the scattered papers now in one, now in an opposite manner. Evidently much was at first circulated in detached portions, and the collection of these afterwards made by some admirer was a very accidental one. Hence duplicates of many portions are found in different places. And the manuscripts which have come down to us exhibit great discrepancies in the arrangement.^{64a}

Such being the nature of the whole, it is not possible always to distinguish with certainty between *Jewish* and *Christian* matter. The oldest portions are at all events Jewish, worked up perhaps with single small heathen oracles. The main body of the later books is certainly Christian. But neither the one nor the other appears in large and closely connected masses. As a rule we have always but small portions quite loosely strung together, and often without any connection. Hence it is only with respect to single and comparatively small portions that we can pass a certain judgment, as to whether they are Jewish or Christian. Much is of so neutral a character, that it may just as well have proceeded from one side as from the other. *The following portions may with some probability be distinguished as Jewish.*

^{64a} The preface of the compiler of our present collection is still preserved (Friedlieb, Appendix, pp. ii.-vii. Alexandre's 1st ed. i. 2-13, 2nd ed. pp. 14-21). Alexandre thinks he can place it in the sixth century after Christ (1st ed. ii. 421-435, 2nd ed. p. xxxvi. sqq.).

1. The most ancient and certainly Jewish portions are in any case contained in the *third book*. All critics since Bleek concur in this opinion. Views, however, differ widely as to any nearer determination, whether of the date of composition or of the extent of the Jewish portions. According to Bleek, Book iii. 97–807 (according to another computation, iii. 35–746) is the work of an Alexandrian Jew of the time of the Maccabees (170–160 B.C.), and contains also a working up of older Jewish fictions (97–161, 433–488 [= 35–99, 371–426]), and later Christian interpolations (350–380 [= 289–318]). The majority of Bleek's successors regard the whole as Jewish. Gfrörer, Lücke, and Friedlieb concur with Bleek with regard to the date of composition. Hilgenfeld, on the ground of an ingenious exposition of the difficult section iii. 388–400, places the whole (iii. 97–817) about 140 B.C., and is followed herein by Reuss, Badt, and Wittichen. Zündel also accepted his exposition of iii. 388–400, but kept to Bleek's view of the earlier date of composition. Ewald went a little farther forward than Hilgenfeld, by placing the composition of Book iii. 97–828 at about 124 B.C. But while all hitherto mentioned agree in assuming a Jewish authorship, Alexandre ascribes only the portions iii. 97–294, 489–817, to an Alexandrian Jew of about 168 B.C., and the intermediate portion, 295–488, on the contrary to a Christian writer. Larocque, while going still farther in the division, agrees with Alexandre in regarding the bulk of Book iii. 97–294, 489–828 as written about 168 B.C., but admits also later interpolations in the last section, and considers the sections iii. 1–96 and 295–488 as “subordinate collections of heterogeneous pieces,” of which only certain individual portions belong to the author of the two first-named large portions. Delaunay also esteems the portions iii. 97–294 and 489–817 not as single productions, but as aggregates of separate unconnected oracles of different periods, ranging from about the beginning to the middle of the second century B.C.

For the purpose of forming a judgment we will first give

a survey of the contents, with the omission of the section iii. 1-96, which certainly does not belong to what follows. The rest is clearly divided by means of the recent additions in vers. 295 and 498 into three groups (97-294, 295-488, 489-828). The beginning of *the first group* is wanting. It commences abruptly by recalling the building of the Tower of Babel and the Confusion of Tongues as the causes of the dispersion of mankind in all lands (97-100). When the whole earth was peopled, the sovereignty over it was divided between Chronos, Titan, and Japetos. All three at first ruled peacefully near each other, but a quarrel arose between Chronos and Titan, which was only settled for a time by an assembly of the gods (or as the Jewish author expresses it, by an assembly of the βασιλεῖς), and resulted in the contest between the Chronides and Titans, and the destruction of both these races. After their annihilation arose successively the kingdoms of the Egyptians, Persians, Medes, Ethiopians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Macedonians, then again of the Egyptians, and lastly of the Romans (110-161). Now first does the Sibyl begin to prophesy; in the first place the prosperity of the Solomonian kingdom, then the Graeco-Macedonian, lastly the many-headed (πολύκρανος) kingdom of the Romans. After the seventh king of Egypt of the Hellenic race, the people of God again attain to sovereignty and will be to all mortals a leader of life (162-195). The judgment of God will fall upon all the kingdoms of the world, from the Titans and Chronides onwards. Even the pious men of Solomon's kingdom will be visited by misfortune. Here the author takes occasion to give a sketch of the Jewish people, their reverence for God, and the main points of their history from their departure from Egypt down to Cyrus (196-294). The *second group* is almost entirely taken up with announcements of judgments and calamities: Against Babylon (295-313), against Egypt (314-318), against Gog and Magog (319-322), against Libya (323-333). After the signs which forebode calamity have been stated, there

follow proclamations of woe to single towns and countries, concluding with the promise of a universal condition of Messianic prosperity and peace in Asia and Europe (341-380). Then follow oracles concerning Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors (381-400), concerning Phrygia, Troy (interspersed with polemic against Homer), Lycia, Cyprus, Italy, and other countries, towns and islands (401-488). The *third group* begins with oracles concerning Phoenicia, Crete, Thrace, Gog and Magog, the Hellenes (489-572); it then points to the people of Israel, who cleave to the law of God, and do not devote themselves to idolatry and unnatural crimes (573-600). Hereupon follows a second prophecy of judgment upon the sinful world terminating in promises (601-623), and an exhortation to conversion, with a description of the ruin which will come upon the ungodly world, and especially upon Hellas (624-651). The promise of the Messianic King, a prophecy of judgment, and a detailed description of Messianic prosperity, interspersed with exhortations to Hellas to cease from their presumption, and references to omens of the last judgment, form the conclusion (652-807). The Sibyl says in the epilogue, that she came from Babylon, but was wrongly regarded by the Greeks as a native of Erythraea (808-817), also that she was a daughter of Noah, and had been with him in the ark at the time of the Deluge (818-828).⁶⁵

This survey of the contents shows, that in any case we have not to deal with a single composition. In the second group especially, the different portions are entirely unconnected with each other. Hence it is in any case *a collection of separate oracles*. Nevertheless it is at least possible, that the greater number of them are the work of one author. For there is not sufficient support for accepting either a heathen

⁶⁵ Bleek denies the authorship of the whole epilogue to the composer of the rest. With respect to the first half (808-817) there is no valid ground for such denial. It might rather be doubted whether the first and second halves belong to each other. See Hilgenfeld, *Apokal.* pp. 78-80.

or a Christian origin of the pieces. The mythological portion at the beginning, which kindly makes the heathen gods guiltless human kings of antiquity, may very well have been written by a Jew, nay this kind of intermixture of Greek and Jewish legends just corresponds with the character of Hellenistic Judaism. There exists however no reason for supposing that it contains Christian elements, since instead of *υἱὸν θεοῦ* in ver. 775 the correct reading is probably *νηὸν θεοῦ* (see vol. ii. p. 139). The circumstance that the time of the seventh Ptolemy is referred to in all three groups (vers. 191–193, 316–318, 608–610) speaks for their virtual connection. Hence the inference attained with respect to the date of composition of the separate portions may with a certain amount of probability be extended to the whole.

For determining the *date of composition*, the following limits exist. The author is acquainted with the Book of Daniel (vers. 388–400), and the expeditions of Antiochus Epiphanes to Egypt (vers. 611–615). On the other hand Rome is still a republic (ver. 176: *πολύκρανος*). But the most accurate limit is furnished by the threefold recurrence of the assurance, that the end will appear under the seventh king of Egypt of Hellenic race (vers. 191–193, 316–318, 608–610). Hence the author wrote under Ptolemy VII. Physcon, who at first reigned together with his brother Ptolemy VI. Philometor (170–164 B.C.), was then banished from Egypt, but attained after his brother's death to the sole sovereignty (145–117 B.C.). When Zundel thinks, that because the king is called *βασιλεὺς νέος* (ver. 608), only the years from 170–164 B.C. can be thought of, since Ptolemy Physcon could by no means be any longer called young after the year 145, it must be answered, that *νέος* means not only "young," but "new." The proper sovereignty however of Ptolemy Physcon did not begin till the year 145. And that the author intended just this period of sole sovereignty is already in and by itself probable; for he would have designated the joint government of the two

brothers as the sixth kingship. This too is confirmed by the plain allusions to the destruction of Carthage and Corinth (vers. 484 sq., 487 sq.), both which cities were, as is well known, destroyed in the year 146 before Christ. The section vers. 388–400 also leads, according to the ingenious, but not indeed quite certain explanation of Hilgenfeld, to the same period (*Apokalyptik*, p. 69 sq.; *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 314 sqq., 1871, p. 35). Here Antiochus Epiphanes is first referred to, and his overthrow then prophesied: “He will himself destroy their race, through whose race his race also will be destroyed. He has a single root, which also the manslayer (Ares) will eradicate out of ten horns. But he will plant another shoot beside it. He will eradicate the warlike progenitor of a royal race. And he himself is exterminated by the sons. And then will a horn planted near rule.”⁶⁶ The race which Antiochus Epiphanes will destroy is that of his brother Seleucus IV. The sole root of Antiochus Epiphanes, viz. his son Antiochus V. Eupator, is murdered by Demetrius I., son of Seleucus IV., or, as the author expresses it, he is eradicated out of ten horns, *i.e.* as the last of ten kings. The shoot, which the god of war plants near, is Alexander Balas. He will exterminate the warlike progenitor of a royal race, viz. Demetrius I. But he will be himself destroyed by Demetrius II. and Antiochus VII. Sidetes, sons of Balas. And then will the upstart Trypho rule (146–139 B.C.). According to this explanation of Hilgenfeld, our author would have written about 140 B.C. And to this we must in any case adhere, even if the details of the explanation should not be all correct.⁶⁷ Traces of a later time can

⁶⁶ Vers. 394–400: Ὡν δὴ περ γενεὴν αὐτὸς θέλει ἐξαπολέσσαι,
 Ἐκ τῶν δὴ γενεῆς κείνου γένος ἐξαπολεῖται
 Ρίζαν ἴαν γε διδοῦς, ἣν καὶ κόψει βροτολογιγός
 Ἐκ δέκα δὴ κεράτων, παρὰ δὲ φυτὸν ἄλλο φυτεύσει.
 Κόψει πορφυρέης γενεῆς γενετῆρα μαχητὴν,
 Καὶ τὸς ἀφ’ υἱῶν, ὧν ἐς ὁμόφρονα αἴσιον ἄρρης,
 Φθείται· καὶ τότε δὴ παραφύμενον κέρας ἄρξει.

The words ὧν ἐς ὁμόφρονα αἴσιον ἄρρης are certainly corrupt.

⁶⁷ Two things only are suspicious: (1) The subject of κόψει, ver. 398,

scarcely be found. For the western nation, which according to vers. 324, 328 sq. is to take part in the destruction of the temple, is not the Roman, but according to Ezek. xxxviii. 5 the Libyan (so Lücke, Hilgenfeld). Only vers. 464—470 seem to turn upon later Roman times, and to be an insertion (Hilgenfeld, *Apokal.* p. 72; *Zeitschr.* 1871, p. 35 sq.).

The conclusion arrived at is also confirmed by *external testimony*. For according to the information of Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene, i. 23 = Syncell. ed. Dindorf, i. 81 = Cyrill. *adv. Julian.* ed. Spanh. p. 9, the prophecy of the Sibyl concerning the building of the Tower of Babel and the conflict between the Chronides and Titans which followed it, was already expressly quoted under the name of the Sibyl (*Σίβυλλα δέ φησιν*, etc.) by Alexander Polyhistor, and therefore in the first half of the first century before Christ, in his *Χαλδαϊκά*.⁶⁸ Such are also found, especially from the third book,⁶⁹ among the oldest patristic quotations.

2. To the oldest Jewish Sibylline oracles undoubtedly belong also the two extensive fragments (together eighty-four verses) communicated by Theophilus, *ad Autol.* ii. 36. Single verses from them are also quoted by other Fathers.⁷⁰ These are not found in our manuscripts. In the editions they are generally printed at the head of the whole collection, because

seems to be not *φυτὸν ἄλλο*, but the god of war, and *αἰτός*, ver. 399, not to go upon *φυτὸν ἄλλο*, but upon *γενετήρ*. (2) Alexander Balas was not overthrown by Demetrius II. and Antiochus VII., but by the former and his father-in-law Ptolemy VI. Philometor (1 Macc. xi. 1—19; Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 4. 5—8).

⁶⁸ The quotation in Josephus is taken from Alexander Polyhistor without mention of his name (*Antt.* i. 4. 3 = Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 15). See Bleek, i. 148—152. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyh.* p. 25, note. The statements too concerning the building of the Tower of Babel in Abydenus (Euseb. *Chron.* i. 34 and *Praep. evang.* ix. 14. Syncell. i. 81 sq. Cyrill. p. 9).

⁶⁹ Athenagoras, *Suppl.* c. 30. Theophilus, *ad Autol.* ii. 31. Tertullian, *ad nationes*, ii. 12. Clemens Alex. *Protrept.* vi. 70, vii. 74. Pseudo-Justin. *Cohort. ad Graec.* c. 16.

⁷⁰ Gnostic fragment in Hippolyt. *Philosophum.* v. 16. Clemens Alex. *Protrept.* ii. 27; *Protr.* vi. 71 = *Strom.* v. 14. 108; *Protr.* viii. 77 = *Strom.* v. 14. 115; *Strom.* iii. 3. 14. Pseudo-Justin. *Cohort. ad Graec.* c. 16. Lactantius, i. 6. 15—16, 7. 13, 8. 3; ii. 11. 18 (?), 12. 19; iv. 6. 5. *Id. de ira dei*, c. 22. 7.

Theophilus says that they stood at the beginning of the Sibyl's prophecy (ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς προφητείας αὐτῆς). But the present first and second books being very recent and placed quite by accident at the beginning of the collection, and the third book being certainly the oldest part, it may be assumed beforehand that these pieces formed *the introduction to our third book*. This supposition, probable in itself, becomes a certainty through the fact, that Lactantius, among his numerous citations, calls only such portions as are found in the Theophilus fragments and in our third book, prophecies of the Erythraean Sibyl, nay evidently quotes both as parts of one book.⁷¹ The contents of these verses may be called the special programme of all Jewish Sibyllism: they contain an energetic direction to the only true God and as energetic a polemic against idolatry. From no portion can the tendency of Jewish Sibyllism be better perceived than from this proem.

3. Section iii. 36–92 (according to another computation: vers. 36–62 of the intermediate section between Books ii. and iii. and Book iv. 1–30), now standing at the beginning of the third book, is also a Jewish fragment of the prae-Christian period. Bleek already perceived, that this fragment proceeded from an Alexandrian Jew of the time of the first triumvirate

⁷¹ Comp. Bleek, i. 160–166. Lactantius distinguishes the different books as different Sibyls. When after quoting from one book he makes a quotation from another, he says: *alia Sibylla dicit*. Among his somewhere about fifty quotations, extending over Books iii. to viii. of our collection, only those from the proem preserved in Theophilus and from the third book, are entitled prophecies of the Erythraean Sibyl. From the proem: Lact. i. 6. 13–16, 8. 3; ii. 12. 19; iv. 6. 5. From the third book: Lact. ii. 16. 1 (=Sib. iii. 228, 229, ed. Friedlieb); iv. 6. 5 (=Sib. iii. 774); iv. 15. 29 (=Sib. iii. 814–817); vii. 19. 9 (=Sib. iii. 618); vii. 20. 1–2 (=Sib. iii. 741, 742); vii. 24. 12 (=Sib. iii. 787–793). The passage, Lact. iv. 6. 5, is however the most instructive: Sibylla Erythraea in carminis sui principio, quod a summo Deo exorsa est, filium Dei ducem et imperatorem omnium his versibus praedicat: παντοτράφον κτίστην ὅστις γλυκὺ πνεῦμα ἅπασιν || κάτθετο, καὶ ἡγητῆρα θεῶν πάντων ἐποίησε (=proem, vers. 5–6). Et rursus in fine ejusdem carminis: αὐτὸν ἔδωκε θεὸς πιστοῖς ἀνδράσι γεραίρειν (=Sib. iii. 774, ed. Friedlieb). Et alia Sibylla praecipit hunc oportere cognosci: αὐτὸν σὺν γίνωσκε θεόν, θεοῦ υἱὸν ἔοντα (=Sib. viii. 329). Here then it is plainly said, that the proem belongs to our third book.

(40–30 B.C.), and he has justly found general acquiescence. So Gfrörer, Lücke, Friedlieb, Hilgenfeld (*Apokal.* p. 241), Reuss, Larocque (at least for vers. 26–52) and Wittichen. Only Badt (pp. 54–61) goes as far as 25 B.C., thinking, according to a suggestion made by Frankel, that the Σεβαστηνοί of ver. 63 must mean inhabitants of Sebaste-Samaria. Alexandre and Ewald indeed ascribe the oracle to a Christian author of the time of the Antonines (Alexandre), or even of about A.D. 300 (Ewald). Bleek's view is however the best founded. The piece begins with a cry of woe to the wicked race, which is full of all crimes. With this is combined the prophecy, that when Rome rules over Egypt also, then will begin the judgment and the rule of the Messianic King. Even this definition of time: "when Rome rules over Egypt also" (ver. 46: *Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Ῥώμῃ καὶ Αἰγύπτου βασιλεύσει*), points to a period when the rule of Rome over Egypt was something new, therefore to the time of Antony, soon after 40 B.C. The date becomes perfectly clear by the allusion to the triumvirate of Antony, Octavius, and Lepidus (ver. 52: *Τρεῖς Ῥώμην οἰκτρῇ μοίρῃ καταδηλήσονται*), and by the mention of the widow, under whose hands the world finds itself being governed by her and obeying her in all things, *i.e.* Cleopatra (vers. 75–80). Hence the oracle was written between 40 and 30 B.C. To go farther down is inadmissible, the end being expected during the lifetime of Cleopatra. The mention of the Σεβαστηνοί (ver. 63), on account of which Badt would place the oracle as late as 25 B.C., may safely be laid to the account of a later interpolator. It is probable, as Bleek and Lücke suppose, that the bracketed words in vers. 60–63 should be expunged,—

Ἡξει γὰρ, ὅπoταν θείου διαβήσεται ὁδμῇ
 Πᾶσιw ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν, [Ἀτὰρ τὰ ἕκαστ' ἀγορεύσω,
 Ὅσσαις ἐν πόλεσιν μέροπες κακότητα φέρουσιν
 Ἐκ δὲ Σεβαστηνῶν ἥξει] Βελίαρ μετόπισθεν.

4. Opinions are more divided concerning the *fourth book* than with regard to the passages hitherto treated of. The

majority of older critics regard it as Christian. Friedlieb, Ewald, Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschr.* 1871, pp. 44–50) and especially Badt (1878) admit a Jewish author and place its composition about A.D. 80.⁷² This view must be allowed to pass as correct. For there is nothing at all specifically Christian in the book. The Sibyl, who at the commencement calls herself the prophetess of the true God, proclaims by His commission manifold calamities through war, earthquakes and other natural events to the cities, countries, and peoples of Asia and Europe. Unless they repent, God will destroy the whole world by fire and will then raise men from the dead and sit in judgment, sending the ungodly to Tartarus and bestowing a new life on earth upon the godly. There is nothing in these particulars to recall the Christian sphere of thought, although it would hardly be possible to a Christian author to avoid mentioning Christ, when writing on eschatology. Nor are there any grounds for supposing the author to have been an Essene (so Ewald and Hilgenfeld). For the polemic against animal sacrifices (ver. 29) is only directed against heathen sacrifices; and the baptism to which the heathen are summoned is merely Jewish proselyte baptism (comp. Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 323). For determining the date of composition it is decisive, that the destruction of Jerusalem (vers. 115–127) and the eruption of Vesuvius of A.D. 79 (vers. 130–136) are presupposed. The author also believes with many of his contemporaries in Nero's flight across the Euphrates and his impending return (vers. 117–124, 137–139). Consequently the oracle must have been composed about A.D. 80 or not much later, and more probably in Asia Minor (so *e.g.* Lightfoot and Badt) than in Palestine (so Freudenthal). The patristic quotations from this book begin with Justin.⁷³ It is also noteworthy that two

⁷² So too Lightfoot (*St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, 2nd ed. 1876, p. 96 sq.) and Freudenthal (*Alex. Polyhistor*, pp. 129, 195). Comp. also my account of the work of Badt in the *Theol. Litztg.* 1878, p. 358. Dechent again gives his decision for the Christian authorship, *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.* ii. 491–496.

⁷³ Justin. *Apol.* i. 20 (refers to *Sib.* iv. 172–177). Clemens Alex. *Protrept.*

verses included in it (97-98) are already mentioned by Strabo p. 536, as oracular sayings.

5. Very divergent are the decisions of critics concerning the *fifth book*. Bleek distinguishes the following portions as Jewish:—(a) vers. 260-285, 481-531, written about the middle of the second century before Christ, by an Alexandrian Jew; (b) vers. 286-332 by a Jew of Asia Minor soon after A.D. 20; (c) perhaps also vers. 342-433 by a Jewish author about A.D. 70. While Lücke entirely, and Gfrörer at least partly, agree with Bleek, Friedlieb ascribes the whole fifth book to a Jew of the beginning of Hadrian's reign, and Badt to a Jew of about A.D. 130; Ewald, Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschr.* 1871, pp. 37-44) and Hildebrandt regard at least Book v. 52-531 as the work of a Jew of about A.D. 80 (Ewald) or a few years earlier (Hilgenfeld, Hildebrandt); while Alexandre, Reuss and Dechent (*Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.* ii. 497 sqq.) attribute the book to a Christian Jew. It seems to me a vain effort to attempt to settle in detail the origin and date of composition of the pieces combined in this book. For it is palpable, that we have here no compact whole, but a loose conglomerate of heterogeneous portions. *The greater number are certainly of Jewish origin*; for the sections, in which Jewish interests and views are brought more or less plainly forward, run through the whole book (comp. especially vers. 260-285, 328-332, 344-360, 397-413, 414-433, 492-511). On the other hand the remarkable passage vers. 256-259, in which "the excellent man coming from heaven who spreads out his hands on the fruit-bearing tree" (Jesus) is identified with Joshua (Jesus the son of Nave) is certainly Christian.⁷⁴ Thus Jewish and Christian pieces are at all

iv. 50 and 62; *Paedag.* ii. 10. 99, iii. 3. 15; *Constit. apostol.* v. 7. Pseudo-Justin. *Cohort.* c. 16. Lactant. vii. 23. 4. *Id. de ira dei*, c. 23 (three passages).

⁷⁴ *Sib.* vers. 256-259:—

Εἰς δὲ τις ἵσσεται αὐθις ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἔξοχος ἀνὴρ,
 Οὐ παλάμῃς ἤπλωσεν ἐπὶ ξύλον πολύκαρπον
 Ἑβραίων ὁ ἄριστος, ὃς ἡελίου ποτε στήσεν,
 Φωνήσας ῥήσει τε καλῇ καὶ χεῖλεσιν ἀγνοῖς.

events combined in this book. The summing up of the discrepant elements under the common term "Judaeo-Christian" is as unhappy an expedient as it is *e.g.* in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. When however the mixture of Jewish and Christian pieces in this fifth book is acknowledged, it cannot in many instances, where religion is a matter of indifference, be determined to which side they belong. So much only is certain, that the Jewish element preponderates. With such characteristics it is also impossible to determine the respective *dates of composition*. In the Jewish pieces the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem (397-413) and apparently the destruction also of the Onias-temple in Egypt (so far as vers. 492-511 refer to this) are lamented. These pieces and consequently the main body of the book might then have been written in the first century after Christ. On the other hand, the chronological oracle at the beginning (vers. 1-51) certainly leads as far as to the time of Hadrian. Quotations are first found in Clemens Alexandrinus.⁷⁵

6. Of the remaining books, vi. vii. and viii. are generally and correctly esteemed to be of Christian authorship.⁷⁶ The origin on the other hand of Books i.-ii. and xi.-xiv. is doubtful. Most investigators regard these also as Christian. Lücke, Friedlieb and Dechent on the contrary ascribe Book xi. and Friedlieb Book xiv. also to a Jewish author. Dechent attempts, as Friedlieb also partly does, to point out in Books i. and ii. Jewish pieces of greater extent. How difficult it is to find sure footing in this respect is proved by the circumstance, that Lücke in a later section of his work (*Einl. die Offenb. des Joh.* p. 269 sqq.) retracted his view concerning Book xi. and ascribed it to a Christian author.⁷⁷ This eleventh book is

⁷⁵ Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* iv. 50; *Paedag.* ii. 10. 99.

⁷⁶ The eighth book (viii. 217-250) contains the famous acrostic upon *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς θεοῦ υἱὸς σωτὴρ σωτὴρ*, which is also given in Constantine's *Oratio ad sanct. coet.* (= Euseb. *Vita Const.* v.) c. 18.

⁷⁷ So also Bleek in his notice of Lücke's book (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 976). According to this the statement in Dechent (*Dissert.* p. 49), that Bleek's view concerning Book xi. "was not known," must be corrected.

really **not** worth contesting. It is a religiously colourless versified history of Egypt down to the beginning of the Roman supremacy, and may just as well be Jewish as Christian. Nor is it very different with the other pieces. The portions separated by Dechent from Books i. and ii. *may* in fact be Jewish, but they may just as well be Christian, and their entire lack of attestation by the Fathers of the first three centuries rather speaks for a later, *i.e.* a Christian origin.⁷⁸

The most ancient author who quotes a Jewish Sibylline book (and indeed *Sib.* iii. 97 sqq. ed. Friedlieb) is Alexander Polyhistor about 80–40 B.C. See the passage from his *Χαλδαϊκά* in Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene, i. 23 = Syncell. ed. Dindorf, i. 81 = Cyrill. *adv. Julian.* ed. Spanh. p. 9. The almost verbally identical passage in Josephus, *Antt.* i. 4. 3 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 15), is copied from Alexander Polyhistor without mention of his name. Comp. p. 282 above.

On the use of the Sibyllines by the Fathers, see Vervorst, *De carminibus Sibyllinis apud sanctos Patres disceptatio*, Paris 1844. Besançon, *De l'emploi que les Pères de l'église ont fait des oracles sibyllins*, Montauban 1851. Alexandre's 1st ed. vol. ii. (1856) pp. 254–311. A collection of the most ancient quotations is also given in Harnack's *Patres apostol.*, note on Hermas, *Vis.* ii. 4. A thorough discussion of the numerous citations in Lactantius is given by Struve, *Fragmenta librorum Sibyllinorum quae apud Lactantium reperiuntur*, Regiom. 1817. A manuscript collection by the Scotchman Sedulius (ninth century) of the quotations in Lactantius is printed in Montfaucon's *Paleogr. gr.* lib. iii. cap. vii. pp. 243–247, and from this in Gallandi's *Biblioth. patr.* i. 400–406, comp. his *proleg.* p. lxxxi.

Whether Clemens Romanus has quoted the Sibyllines is doubtful. For it is said in the pseudo-Justinian *Quaestt. et respons. ad orthodoxos*, quaest. 74 (*Corp. apolog.* ed. Otto, 3rd ed. vol. v. p. 108): εἰ τῆς παρούσης καταστάσεως τὸ τέλος ἐστὶν ἢ διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς κρίσις τῶν ἀσεβῶν, καθά φασιν αἱ γραφαὶ προφητῶν τε καὶ ἀποστόλων, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῆς Σιβύλλης, καθὼς φησιν ὁ μακάριος Κλήμης ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῇ. The Sibyl not being mentioned in the received text of the Clementine Epistles, the καθὼς must

⁷⁸ The oldest testimony which Dechent (*Dissert.* p. 37) can point out, is found in Constantine's *Oratio ad sanct. coet.* (= Euseb. *Vita Const.* v.) c. 18: ἡ τοίνυν Ἑρυθραία Σιβυλλὰ φάσκουσα ἑαυτὴν ἔκτῃ γενεᾷ, μετὰ τὸ κατακλυσμόν, γενέσθαι. Comp. *Sib.* i. 283 sqq.

probably be taken as parallel to the *καθά*, and thus the words *ἐν δὲ καὶ τῇς Σιβυλλῆς* are not the words of Clement but of the pseudo-Justin. Comp. Harnack's 2nd ed. of the Clementine Epistles, Proleg. p. xl.; Otto in his note on the passage is of the contrary opinion. Hermas, *Vis.* ii. 4, mentions only the Sibyl and not the Sibylline books. Quotations from the latter are on the other hand given in the *Predicatio Petri et Pauli* in Clemens Alex. *Strom.* vi. 5. 42–43 (see also Lücke, *Einl. in die Offenb. Joh.* p. 238; Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extra canon. rec.* fasc. iv. 2nd ed. pp. 57, 63 sq.). Gnostics in Hippolyt. *Philosophum.* v. 16. Justin. *Apol.* i. 20. Athenagoras, *Suppl.* c. 30. Theophilus, *ad Autol.* ii. 3. 31, 36. Tertullian, *ad nationes*, ii. 12. Pseudo-Melito, *Apol.* c. 4 (in Otto, *Corp. apolog.* vol. ix. pp. 425, 463 sq.). Pseudo-Justin. *Cohortat. ad Graec.* c. 16, 37–38. Const. *Apost.* v. 7. Constantini *Oratio ad sanct. coet.* (= Euseb. *Vita Const.* v.) c. 18–19. Quotations abound most in Clemens Alex. and Lactantius.

Clemens Alexandrinus quotes: (1) The prooemium: *Protrept.* ii. 27. *Protr.* vi. 71 = *Strom.* v. 14. 108. *Protr.* viii. 77 = *Strom.* v. 14. 115. *Strom.* iii. 3. 14. (2) The third book: *Protr.* vi. 70, vii. 74. (3) The fourth book: *Protrept.* iv. 50 and 62. *Paedag.* ii. 10. 99, iii. 3. 15. (4) The fifth book: *Protrept.* iv. 50. *Paedag.* ii. 10. 99. Comp. also *Strom.* i. 21. 108, 132. *It is seen from these statistics that just the three books which on internal grounds we esteem (or at least their greater part) to be Jewish, and these only, were known to Clement.* Other patristic quotations too down to Clement refer to these books alone. They thus evidently form the most ancient Jewish body of Sibylline oracles.

Lactantius quotes about fifty passages from our Sibyllines, most frequently from Book viii., next to this from Book iii., only sometimes from Books iv. v. vi. and vii., from the rest not at all. See the material in Struve and Alexandre. Hence it seems, that he was acquainted with only Books iii. to viii. of our present collection. He must however have had in them somewhat which is lacking in our MSS.; for apart from the passages from the *prooemium*, which indeed is only preserved to us by Theophilus, other quotations are also found in Lactantius, which cannot be pointed out in our texts, Lact. vii. 19. 2, viii. 24. 2. The verses too cited by Lactantius, ii. 11. 18, and very probably belonging to the prooemium, are not contained in Theophilus. Lactantius expresses himself in general on the books known to him as follows: *Inst.* 1, 6 (after an enumeration of the *ten* Sibyls), *Harum omnium Sibyllarum carmina et feruntur et habentur praeterquam Cymaeae, cujus libri a Romanis occuluntur nec eos ab ullo nisi quindecimviris inspectos habent.*

Et sunt singularum singuli libri, qui quia Sibyllae nomine inscribuntur, unius esse creduntur; suntque confusi, nec discerni ac suum cuique adsignari potest, nisi Erythraeae, quae et nomen suum verum carmini inseruit, et Erythraeam se nominat, ubi praelocuta est, quum esset orta Babylone.

Celsus also testifies to the credit of the Sibyllines among Christians (Orig. *c. Celsus*, vi. 61, vii. 53, 56). Celsus, however, already charges the Christians with having forged the oracles, nor were such charges subsequently wanting. Comp. the allusions in Constantine's *Oratio ad sanct. coet.* (= Euseb. *Vita Const.* v.) c. 19. 1. Lactant. *Inst.* iv. 15. 26. Augustine, *de civ. Dei*, xviii. 46.

On the credit and use of the Sibyllines in the *Middle Ages*, see Alexandre's 1st ed. ii. 287–311. Lücken, "Die sibyllinischen Weissagungen, ihr Ursprung und ihr Zusammenhang mit den afterprophetischen Darstellungen christlicher Zeit" (*Katholische Studien*, No. V.), Würzb. 1875. Vogt, "Ueber Sibyllenweissagung" (*Beiträge zur Gesch. der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, edited by Paul and Braune, vol. iv. 1877, pp. 48–100). Bang, *Voluspá und die sibyllinischen Orakel*, translated from the Danish, Wien 1880.

On the *manuscripts*, see Friedlieb, *De codicibus Sibyllinorum manuscriptis in usum criticum nondum adhibitis commentatio*, Vratislav. 1847. Friedlieb's edition, Introd. p. lxxii. sqq. and App. pp. ix.–xii. Alexandre's 1st ed. vol. i. p. xliii. sqq.; his 2nd ed. pp. xxxviii.–xlii. Volkmann, *Lectiones Sibyllinae*, Pyritz 1861. Bernhardt, *Grundriss der griech. Literatur*, ii. 1 (3rd ed. 1867), p. 452 sq.

On the *editions*, see Gallandi, *Biblioth. patr.* i. p. 81. Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, i. 257–261. Bleek, i. p. 123 sq. Alexandre's 1st ed. vol. i. pp. xxx.–xliii. The first edition superintended by Xystus Betuleius, according to an Augsburg now a Munich manuscript, was brought out by Oporinus in Basle 1545. The same with a Latin translation by Seb. Castalio (which first appeared separately in 1546), Basle 1555. The most esteemed among the older editions is that of Opsopöus, Paris 1599 (repeated in 1607; the account by the bibliographers of a supposed edition of 1589 rests upon a mistake). The edition of Gallaeus, Amsterdam 1689, is less esteemed. The Sibyllines have appeared besides in various collections, *e.g.* in Gallandi's *Bibliotheca veterum patrum*, vol. i. (Venetiis 1788) pp. 333–410; comp. Proleg. pp. lxxvi.–lxxxii. *All these editions contain only the first eight books.* The fourteenth book was first published from a Milan manuscript by Angelo Mai (*Sibyllae liber xiv. editore et interprete Angelo Maio*, Mediolan. 1817); and afterwards Books xi. to xiv. from two

Vatican manuscripts by the same (*Scriptorum veterum nova collectio ed. ab Angelo Maio*, vol. iii. 3, 1828, pp. 202–215). Everything hitherto known is combined in the editions of Alexandre (*Oracula Sibyllina, curante C. Alexandre*, 2 vols. Paris 1841–1856. *Editio altera ex priore ampliore contracta, integra tamen et passim aucta, multisque locis retractata*, Paris 1869 [the copious Excursi of the first edition are omitted in this second one]) and of Friedlieb (*Die sibyllinischen Weissagungen vollständig gesammelt, nach neuer Handschriften-Vergleichung, mit kritischen Commentare und metrischer deutscher Uebersetzung*, Leipzig 1852). A Latin translation is added to most editions, a German one to that of Friedlieb. A French one has been commenced by Bouché Leclercq (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, vol. vii. 1883, pp. 236–248; vol. viii. 1883, pp. 619–634, etc.).

Contributions to textual criticism: Volkmann, *De oraculis Sibyllinis dissertatio, supplementum editionis a Friedliebno exhibitae*, Lips. 1853. The same, *Specimen novae Sibyllinorum editionis*, Lips. 1854 (containing the first book). A discussion of Alexandre's edition in the *Philologus*, vol. xv. 1860, p. 317 sqq. The same, *Lectiones Sibyllinae*, Pyritz 1861. X., "Zur Textkritik der sibyllin. Bücher" (*Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1861, pp. 437–439). Meineke, "Zu den sibyllinischen Büchern" (*Philologus*, vol. xxviii. 1869, pp. 577–598). Ludwich, "Zu den sibyllinischen Orakeln" (*Neue Jahrb. für Philol. und Pädagogik*, vol. cxvii. 1878, pp. 240–245). Nauck, "Kritische Bemerkungen" (*Mélanges gréco-romains tirés du bulletin de l'académie impériale des sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, vol. ii. 1859–1866, p. 484 sq.; iii. 1869–1874, pp. 278–282; iv. 1875–1880, pp. 155–157, 630–642). Rzach, "Zur Kritik der Sibyllinischen Weissagungen" (*Wiener Studien*, vol. iv. 1882, pp. 121–129). More in Engelmann's *Biblioth. script. class.* ed. Preuss.

Lists of the literature on the Sibyllines in general are given in Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, i. 227–290. Bleek, i. 129–141. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Neuen Testaments*, § 274. Alexandre's 1st ed. ii. 2. 71–82, also 2nd ed. p. 418 sq. Engelmann, *Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum* (8th ed. revised by Preuss), Div. i. 1880, p. 528 sq. The first to investigate the collection according to correct critical principles was: Bleek, "Ueber die Entstehung und Zusammensetzung der uns in 8 Büchern erhaltenen Sammlung Sibyllinischer Orakel" (*Theologische Zeitschrift*, edited by Schleiermacher, de Wette and Lücke, No. 1, 1819, pp. 120–246; No. 2, 1820, pp. 172–239). Comp. also his notice of Lücke's *Einl.* in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1854, pp. 972–979. Gfrörer, *Philo.* vol. ii. 1831, pp. 121–173. Lücke, *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die*

Offenbarung des Johannes (2nd ed. 1852), pp. 66–89, 248–274. Friedlieb's Introd. to his edition (1852). Alexandre's 1st ed. ii. 312–439; 2nd ed. p. 21 sqq. Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (1857), pp. 51–90. The same, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, vol. iii. 1860, pp. 313–319; xiv. 1871, pp. 30–50. Ewald, "Abhandlung über Entstehung Inhalt und Werth der Sibyllischen Bucher" (*Transactions of the Göttinger Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* vol. viii. 1858–1859, hist.-philol. Class. pp. 43–152, also separately). Frankel, "Alexandrinische Messias Hoffnungen" (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1859, pp. 241–261, 285–308, 321–330, 359–364). Volkmann in the "Philologus," vol. xv. 1860, pp. 317–327. Bernhardt, *Grundriss der griechischen Literatur*, ii. 1 (3rd ed. 1867), pp. 441–453. Reuss, art. "Sibyllen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. xiv. 1861, pp. 315–329 (2nd ed. xiv. 1884, pp. 179–191). The same, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments*, 1881, § 489, 490, 537. Zündel, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Abfassungszeit des Buches Daniel*, 1861, pp. 140–172. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi*, 1866, pp. 169–174. Badt, *De oraculis Sibyllinis a Judaeis compositis*, Bresl. 1869. The same, *Ursprung, Inhalt und Text des vierten Buches der sibyllinischen Orakel*, Breslau 1878. Larocque, "Sur la date du troisième livre des Oracles sibyllins" (*Revue archéologique*, new series, vol. xx. 1869, pp. 261–270). Wittichen, *Die Idee des Reiches Gottes*, 1872, pp. 134–144, 160 sq. Dechent, *Ueber das erste, zweite und elfte Buch der sibyllinischen Weissagungen*, Frankf. 1873. The same, "Charakter und Geschichte der altchristlichen Sibyllenschriften" (*Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.* vol. ii. 1878, pp. 481–509). Hildebrandt, "Das römische Antichristenthum zur Zeit der Offenbarung Johannis und des fünften sibyllinischen Buches" (*Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1874, pp. 57–95). Delaunay, *Moines et Sibylles dans l'antiquité judéo-grecque*, Paris 1874. Renan, *Journal des Savants*, 1874, pp. 796–809. Delitzsch, "Versuchte Lösung eines sibyllischen Räthsels" [on i. 137–146], *Zeitschr. für luth. Theol.* 1877, pp. 216–218. *The Edinburgh Review*, No. 299, July 1877, pp. 31–67. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, 1877, pp. 10–17. Nicolai, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, vol. iii. 1878, pp. 335–338.

2. *Hystaspes*.

Ammianus Marcellinus (xxiii. 6. 32–33) relates of Hystaspes the Mede, the father of King Darius, that during his sojourn

among the Indian Brahmins, he learned from them "the laws of the motions of the world and stars and *pure religious customs*" (*purosque sacrorum ritus*), and then imparted some of these to the native Magi, who handed them down to posterity. A Greek work under the name of this Hystaspes, who was thus regarded by antiquity as an authority in religious matters, was known to the Fathers, by whom the following indications concerning it are given. According to Justin, the future destruction of the world by fire was therein predicted. In the *Praedicatio Petri et Pauli* cited by Clemens Alex. it is asserted, that Hystaspes plainly referred to the Son of God, and to the conflict of Messiah and his people with many kings, and to his steadfastness (*ὑπομονή*) and glorious appearing (*παρουσία*). Lastly, according to Lactantius the destruction of the Roman Empire was foretold in it, and also that in the tribulation of the last times, the pious and believing would pray to Zeus for assistance, and that Zeus would hear them and destroy the ungodly. Lactantius finds fault here only with the circumstance, that what God will do is ascribed to Zeus, and at the same time laments, that in consequence of the deceit of the daemons, *nothing* is here said of the sending of the Son of God. From these notices it is evident, that the work was of an apocalyptic and eschatological tenor. Since Lactantius expressly says, that the sending of the Son of God to judge the world is *not* mentioned in it, we must regard it as rather Jewish than Christian. The choice too of Zeus as the name of God, corresponding more with the literary usages of Hellenistic Judaism than with those of Christianity, speaks for its Jewish origin. What the author also of the *Praedicatio Petri et Pauli* says concerning the appearance of the Messiah prophesied of in Scripture, does not go beyond the framework of Jewish expectation. The apparent contradiction between his statement and that of Lactantius may be explained by remembering, that Lactantius only misses the co-operation of the Messiah at the day of judgment. Yet it may be also possible

that the author of the *Praedicatio Petri et Pauli* had an interpolated copy before him. The limits of the date of composition are fixed by the appearance on the one side of the Roman Empire as the power hostile to God, on the other by Justin's acquaintance with the work.

Justin. *Apol.* i. 20: Καὶ Σίβυλλα ■ καὶ Ὑστάσπης γενήσεσθαι τῶν φθαρτῶν ἀνάλωσιν διὰ πυρὸς ἔφασαν. Comp. also c. 44.

Praedicatio Petri et Pauli in Clemens Alex. *Strom.* vi. 5. 42-43 (comp. Lucke, *Einl. in die Offenb. Joh.* p. 238; Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extra canonem rec.* fasc. iv. 2nd ed. pp. 57, 63 sq.): Δάβετε καὶ τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς βίβλους, ἐπίγινωτε Σίβυλλαν, ὡς δηλοῖ ἓνα θεὸν καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι, καὶ τὸν Ὑστάσπην λαβόντες ἀνάγινωτε, καὶ εὐρήσετε πολλῷ τηλαυγέστερον καὶ σαφέστερον γεγραμμένον τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ καθὼς παράταξιν ποιήσουσι τῷ Χριστῷ πολλοὶ βασιλεῖς μισοῦντες αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς φοροῦντας τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς πιστοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ὑπομονὴν καὶ τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ.

Lactantius, *Inst.* vii. 15. 19: Hystaspes quoque, qui fuit Medorum rex antiquissimus . . . admirabile somnium sub interpretatione vaticinantis pueri ad memoriam posteris tradidit, *sublatum iri ex orbe imperium nomenque Romanum*, multo ante praefatus, quam illa Troiana gens conderetur. *Ibid.* vii. 18. 2-3: Hystaspes enim, quem superius nominavi, descripta iniquitate saeculi hujus extremi, pios ac fideles a nocentibus segregatos ait cum fletu et gemitu extensuros esse ad coelum manus et imploratorios fidem Jovis; Jovem respecturum ad terram et auditurum voces hominum atque impios extincturum. Quae omnia vera sunt, praeter unum, quod Jovem dixit illa facturum, quae Deus faciet. Sed et illud non sine daemonum fraude subtractum est, missum iri a patre tunc filium Dei, qui deletis omnibus malis pios liberet.

Comp. in general: Walch, "De Hystaspe" (*Commentationes societatis scientt.* Gotting. vol. ii. 1780). Fabricius - Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* i. 108 sq. A. G. Hoffmann in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgem. Encykl.* § 2, vol. xiii. 1836, p. 71 sq. Lücke. *Einl. in die Offenbarung des Johannes*, 2nd ed. pp. 237-240. Otto's *Anmerkung zu Justin* as above (in his edition of the *Corpus apologet.*).

3 Forged Verses of Greek Poets.

Both Jewish and Christian apologists repeatedly appeal to the most eminent *Greek poets* to prove, that the more intelligent among the Greeks held correct views concerning the nature

of God, His unity, spirituality and supramundane character. Many such quotations, especially in Clemens Alexandrinus, are really taken from the genuine works of these poets, and have been skilfully selected and explained by the apologists.⁷⁹ But among these genuine quotations are also to be found not a few which have been palpably forged in the interest of either Jewish or Christian apologetic. The works where such forged verses have been discovered are chiefly the following:

1. Aristobulus in Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica*, xiii. 12.
2. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* v. 14; also given in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 13; comp. also *Protrept.* vii. 74.
3. The pseudo-Justinian *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, c. 15 and 18.
4. The pseudo-Justinian work, *De monarchia*, c. 2-4 (the two latter in Otto's *Corpus apologetarum christian.* vol. iii.).

The authors to whom the verses are ascribed, are: the great tragic poets Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides; the writers of comedies, Philemon, Menander, Diphilus; a large fragment is ascribed to Orpheus; and certain verses on the Sabbath to Hesiod, Homer and Linus (or Callimachus).

In forming a judgment concerning *the origin of these pieces* the following considerations are of importance. Almost all the portions, which come under notice, are found both in Clemens Al. *Str.* v. 14. 113-133 (=Eus. *Pr.* xiii. 13. 40-62, ed. Gaisford), and in the pseudo-Justinian work, *De monarchia*, c. 2-4. Aristobulus and the *Cohortatio ad Graecos* have only single verses and such as are found in the others also. Both in Clement and in the work *De monarchia* however, the suspicious portions stand pretty thick together; in the *De monarchia* indeed almost without other accessories. It is thus clear that either one made use of the other or that

⁷⁹ So e.g. the celebrated commencement of the *Phaenomena* of Aratus (third century B.C.): 'Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, τὸν οὐδέποτε' ἄνδρες ἴωσιν ἄββητον, etc., from which is derived the saying quoted, Acts xvii. 28: τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἱσμεν. The Jewish philosopher Aristobulus (in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 12. 6, ed. Gaisford) already quotes this verse; also Theophilus, *ad Autol.* ii. 8. Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 101=Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 13. 26

both drew from a common source. A strict observation shows however that the former supposition cannot be accepted. For though the pieces quoted are almost all identical, they are more completely and accurately given now by one now by another.⁸⁰ It is then indubitable that both *drew from a common source*, in which all the suspected pieces were probably found together. What this source was moreover we are directly told by Clement: it was the *work of the pseudo-Hecataeus on Abraham*. For Clement introduces the first of the suspected quotations, a supposed portion of Sophocles, with the words (*Strom.* v. 14. 113 = *Eus. Pr.* xiii. 13. 40, ed. Gaisford): 'Ο μὲν Σοφοκλῆς, ὥς φησιν Ἑκαταῖος ὁ τὰς ἱστορίας συνταξάμενος ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἀβραμὸν καὶ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους, ἀντικρὺς ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἐκβοᾷ. Böckh already showed that he on the whole correctly perceived the state of matters by ascribing all the quotations from the scenic poets (tragic and comic) to the pseudo-Hecataeus. Hence it was no advance when Nauck, *e.g.* (in his edition of the *Fragm. tragic.*), and Otto (in his notes in the *Corp. apologet.*) again spoke of Christian forgeries, for the work of the pseudo-Hecataeus is certainly Jewish. The verdict of Böckh must however be also extended to the large portion from Orpheus and to the verses of Hesiod, Homer and Linus on the Sabbath, which

⁸⁰ *De monarchia*, c. 3, *e.g. comp.* with Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 121-122 (=Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xiii. 13. 47-48), is instructive. First a portion from Sophocles is given in *De monarchia* (ἔσται γάρ, ἔσται, etc.). Then Clement has the same portion but divided into two halves; and the second half is introduced by the formula: καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα αὖθις ἐπιφέρει. Undoubtedly Clement is here the more original. The author of *De monarchia* joined together the two pieces which are not directly connected. A contrary relation takes place in the next following, but in Clement preceding, piece: οἱ σὺ τοὺς θανόντας, of which Clement ascribes the whole to Diphilus, while the author of *De monarchia* ascribes the first and longer half to Philemon, the second and shorter to Euripides. In the latter ascription he is correct, for it contains a few genuine verses of Euripides, which are completed by spurious ones (see Dindorf's note in his edition of Clement). Here then the work "*De monarchia*" preserves the original; Clement by an oversight ascribing the two unconnected pieces to one author.

are already cited by Aristobulus (in Euseb. xiii. 12) and the forgery of which is therefore set by many, *e.g.* Valckenaer, and also Böckh to the credit of Aristobulus. The Orphean piece is also found both in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 123 sqq. (= Euseb. xiii. 13. 50 sqq.) and in the work *De monarchia*, c. 2, in the midst of the forged verses of the tragic and comic poets. And the testimonies of Hesiod and Homer concerning the Sabbath stand at least near in Clement (*Strom.* v. 14. 107 = Euseb. xiii. 13. 34), and in juxtaposition, along with the Orphean piece, certainly in Aristobulus. It is hence very probable that these forgeries also belong to the pseudo-Hecataeus.

If our conjecture is correct, these forgeries belong to the *third century before Christ*; for such is the date of the pseudo-Hecataeus (see next paragraph). It seems that numerous passages from Greek poets were collected in his work, as testimonies to the true belief in God, that among them many were certainly genuine, but that these not seeming sufficiently powerful to the author he enhanced and completed them by verses of his own making. The work was certainly in the hands of Clemens Alex. and the author of *De monarchia* in the original.

Comp. in general: Valckenaer, *Diatrise de Aristobulo Judaeo* (Lugd. Bat. 1806), pp. 1-16, 73-125. Böckh, *Graecae tragodiae principum, Aeschyli Sophoclis Euripidis, num ea quae supersunt et genuina omnia sint et forma primitiva servata, an eorum familiis aliquid debeat ex iis tribui* (Heidelb. 1808), pp. 146-164 (treats especially on the Jewish forgeries). Gfrörer, *Philo*, ii. 74 sqq. (on the Orphean verses). Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie*, ii. 89-94, 225-228. Meineke, *Menandri et Philemonis reliquiae*, Berol. 1823. The same, *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum*, vol. iv. Berol. 1841 (among others the Fragments of Philemon, Menander, Diphilus). Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, Lips. 1856. Cobet in *Δόγμους Ἑρμῆς ἐκδ. ὑπὸ Κόνρου*, vol. i. (Leyden 1866) pp. 176, 454, 459-463, 524. Dindorf's notes on the passages in question in his edition of *Clem. Alex.* Otto's notes on the passages in question in his edition of the *Corpus apologet. christ.* vol. iii. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 566-568 (on the verses quoted by

Aristobulus). Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, pp. 166–169. Huidekoper, *Judaism at Rome* (New York 1876), pp. 336–342.

The several portions are (according to their order in the pseudo-Justinian work *De monarchia*) as follows:—

1. Twelve verses of Aeschylus (Χάριζε θνητῶν τὸν θεόν) on the elevation of God above every creature, *De monarchia*, c. 2 (Otto's *Corpus apologetarum*, 3rd ed. vol. iii. p. 130); Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 131 = Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xiii. 13. 60, ed. Gaisford. Böckh, p. 150 sq. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graec. fragm.* p. 100.

2. Nine verses of Sophocles (Εἷς ταῖς ἀληθεύουσιν) on the unity of God, who made heaven and earth, and on the folly of idolatry, *De monarchia*, c. 2 (Otto's *Corpus apolog.* 3rd ed. vol. iii. p. 132); Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 113 = Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 13. 40, ed. Gaisford; Clem. *Protrept.* vii. 74; Pseudo-Justin. *Cohort. ad. Graec.* c. 18; Cyrill. Alex. *adv. Julian.* ed. Spanh. p. 32; Theodoret, *Graecarum affectionum curatio*, c. vii. s. fin. (*Opp.* ed. Schulze, iv. 896); Malalas, ed. Bonnens. p. 40 sq. Cedrenus, ed. Bonnens. i. 82. The two first verses are also in Athenagoras, *Suppl.* c. 5. Böckh, p. 148 sq. Nauck, *Trag. Graec. Fragm.* p. 284 sq. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* ii. 196. Dindorf's note to Clem. *Strom.* v. 14. 113.

3. Two verses, ascribed in *De monarchia*, c. 2, to the comic poet Philemon, but in Clemens Alex. *Protrept.* vi. 68 to Euripides (Θεὸν δὲ ποῶν), treat of God as one who sees everything, but is himself unseen. On their spuriousness, see Meineke, *Fragmenta comicorum Graec.* iv. 67 sq. Nauck, *Trag. Graec. Frag.* p. 552. Otto, *Corp. Apologet.* 3rd ed. vol. iii. p. 132, note 21. Dindorf's note to Clem. *Protr. l.c.*

4. A long piece attributed to Orpheus is extant in two different recensions, which materially differ from each other. The shortest is that in the two pseudo-Justinian works, *de monarchia*, and *Cohort. ad graec.* c. 15. The text is identical in both, only that in *De monarchia* the two introductory verses are omitted. The *Cohortatio* also gives the text with an abbreviation in the midst (Cyrill. Alex. *adv. Julian.* ed. Spanheim, p. 26). The contents of the piece (one-and-twenty verses in the *Cohort.*) turn upon the thought, that there is but one God who made and still governs all things, who is enthroned in supramundane glory in heaven, invisible, yet everywhere present. If further proof of the Jewish origin of these verses were needed, it is clearly found in the thought, borrowed from Isa. lxvi. 1, that heaven is God's throne and earth His footstool—

Οὗτος γὰρ χάλκειον ἐπ' οὐρανὸν ἐστήρικται
Χρυσέῳ ἐνὶ θρόνῳ, γαίης δ' ἐπὶ ποσσὶ βέβηκε.⁸¹

⁸¹ The same verses run according to Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 124=

It is worthy of remark, that the author lays stress on the notion, that evil too is sent by God—

Οὗτος δ' ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ κακὸν θνητοῖς δίδωσι
Καὶ πόλεμον κρυόντα καὶ ἄλγεα δακρυόντα.

The whole instruction is addressed to Musaeus the son of Orpheus (to the latter according to *Cohort.* c. 15). According to *Monarchia*, c. 2, it is contained in the "Testament of Orpheus" in which, repenting of his former teaching of 360 gods, he proclaimed the one true God (μαρτυρήσει δέ μοι καὶ Ὁρφεύς, ὁ παρειαγαγὼν τοὺς τριακούς ἐξήκοντα θεούς, ἐν τῷ Διαθῆκαι ἐπιγγραφομένῳ βιβλίῳ, ὅποτε μετανοῶν ἐπὶ τούτῳ φαίνεται ἐξ ὧν γράφει). Comp. also *Cohort.* c. 15 and 36, and especially in Theophilus, *ad Autol.* iii. 2: τί γὰρ ὠφέλησεν . . . Ὁρφέα οἱ τριακόσιοι ἐξήκοντα πέντε θεοί, οὓς αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τέλει τοῦ βίου ἀθετεῖ, ἐν ταῖς Διαθήκαις αὐτοῦ λέγων ἔνα εἶναι θεόν.

(b) A longer recension of the same Orphean fragment is given by Aristobulus in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 12. 5. At its commencement it coincides on the whole with the before-named recension, but adds considerably more towards the close, especially a reference to the Chaldaean (Abraham), who alone attained to the true knowledge of God. The passage, according to which God is also the inflicter of evil, is here corrected into its opposite—

Αὐτὸς δ' ἐξ ἀγαθῶν θνητοῖς κακὸν οὐκ ἐπιτέλλει
Ἀνθρώποις· αὐτῷ δὲ χάρις καὶ μῆσος ὁπηρεῖ,
Καὶ πόλεμος καὶ λοιμὸς ἴδ' ἄλγεα δακρυόντα.

Aristobulus names as the source the poems of Orpheus κατὰ τὸν ἱερὸν λόγον (Euseb. *Praep.* xiii. 12. 4: ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ὁρφεύς ἐν ποιήμασι τῶν κατὰ τὸν Ἱερὸν Λόγον αὐτῷ λεγομένων οὕτως ἐκτίθεται).

(c) The quotations in Clemens Alex. *Protrept.* vii. 74; *Strom.* v. 12. 78, and especially *Strom.* v. 14. 123–127 = Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 13. 50–54, ed. Gaisford, represent a third recension. Theodoret, *Graecarum affectionum curatio*, ii. (*Opp.* ed. Schulze, iv. 735 sq.)⁸² again draws from Clement. Clement gives the

Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xiii. 13. 51 (and almost exactly so according to Aristobulus in Euseb. *Praep.* xiii. 12. 5)—

Αὐτὸς δ' αὖ μέγαν αὐτὶς ἐπ' οὐρανὸν ἐστήρικται
Χρυσέῃ εἶναι θρόνῳ, γαίῃ δ' ὑπὸ ποσσὶ βέβηκεν.

Clement already notices the agreement with Isa. lvi. 1.

⁸² Since it can be proved that Theodoret elsewhere borrows such quotations from Clement, there can be no doubt that his text is in the main a combination of Clem. *Strom.* v. 12. 78 and v. 14. 124. Only the first three verses in Theodoret agree in part more with Aristobulus than with Clem. *Protr.* vii. 74.

text only piecemeal, and broken up into separate quotations. But taking all these together, it is clearly seen, that not only the whole portion, given by Aristobulus, but also considerably more was in his hands. Much as he agrees in the main with Aristobulus (especially in having the passage concerning the Chaldee), this only on the other hand makes the coincidences in many details with the pseudo-Justinian works the more striking. Clement also has in particular the passage concerning the infliction of evil by God in its original form, like the pseudo-Justinian works (*Strom.* v. 14. 126 = Euseb. *Praep.* xiii. 13. 53). On the work of Orpheus, from which the passage is taken, Clement agrees with the others in saying, that Orpheus, "after teaching the orgies and the theology of idols, made a recantation conformable with truth by singing, though late, the truly holy doctrine" (*Protrept.* vii. 74: 'Ορφεύς, μετὰ τὴν τῶν δρλίων ἱεροφαντίαν καὶ τῶν εἰδώλων τὴν θεολογίαν, παλινωδίαν ἀληθείας εἰσάγει, τὸν ἱερὸν ὄντως ὁψέ ποτε ὁμῶς δ' οὖν ἄδων λόγον).

On the relation of the three recensions to each other Lobeck (*Aglaophamus*, i. 438 sqq.) has brought forward the view, that the recension of the Justinian works is the oldest, that of Clemens a more recent and that of Aristobulus the most recent, the latter being of a date subsequent to Clemens Alexandrinus (i. 448: Clementis certe temporibus posteriorem). There is however no constraining reason for the last notion. We have ourselves acknowledged, that the text of Aristobulus is in one point secondary in comparison with the other two. That is not however saying, that it is so in every respect. It may be regarded as certain, that none of the three recensions is directly the source of the others. Nor can the short portion in the Justinian works be the archetype, for it is evidently only a fragment from a larger copy, probably with abbreviations in the text. The three recensions will thus fall back upon a common source, which has afterwards been subjected to manifold variations. And this source may very well have been the *pseudo-Hecataeus*. In any case this Orphean passage is one of the boldest forgeries ever attempted. It is a supposed legacy of Orpheus to his son Musaeus, in which, having arrived at the close of his life, he expressly recalls all his other poems, which are dedicated to polytheistic doctrines and proclaims the alone true God. According to Suidas (*Lex. s.v.* 'Ορφεύς) there were ἱεροὺς λόγους ἐν ῥαψωδίαις xδ' of Orpheus. This legacy, to speak with Clement, was to be his true ἱερὸς λόγος. Comp. on this Jewish piece: Gottfr. Hermann, *Orphica*, pp. 447-453 (the text). Valckenaer, *De Aristobulo*, pp. 11-16. 73-85. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, i. 438-465 (the most thorough investigation). Gfrörer, *Philo*, ii. 74 sqq. Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilo-*

sophie, ii. 89-94, 225-228. Abel, *Orphica*, pp. 144-148 (the text). On Orpheus and the Orphean literature in general: Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, i. 140-181. Gottfr. Hermann, *Orphica*, Lips. 1805 (collection of the text and fragments). Lobeck, *Aglaophamus sive de theologiae mysticae Graecorum causis*, 2 vols. Regim. Pr. 1829 (chief work). Klausen, art. "Orpheus," in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgem. Encyclopädie*, § 3, vol. vi. 1835, pp. 9-42. Preller, art. "Orpheus," in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* v. 992-1004. Bernhardt, *Grundriss der griech. Literatur*, ii. 1, 3rd ed. 1867, pp. 408-441. Nicolai, *Griech. Literaturgesch.* i. 445-447, iii. 330-335. Abel, *Orphica*, Lips. 1885 (texts and fragments). Still more literature in Engelmann's *Biblioth. script. class.* ed. Preuss.

5. The next Jewish piece quoted in *De monarchia* is eleven verses of Sophocles on the future destruction of the world by fire, and the different lots of the righteous and unrighteous ("Ἔσται γάρ, ἔσται κείνος αἰῶνων χρόνος"), *De monarchia*, c. 3 (Otto's *Corp. apol.* iii. 136). In Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14, 121-122 = Euseb. *Pr.* xiii. 13. 48, the same verses are cited as words of the *τραγωδία* without naming Sophocles. In Clemens they are also divided into halves by the remark, καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα αὖθις ἐπιφέρει, while pseudo-Justin combines the two halves into a whole. Clement does not give the verses on the different lots of the righteous and unrighteous in this connection, but in the preceding fragment, which he quotes from Diphilus, where they are more suitable (*Strom.* v. 14. 121 = Euseb. *Praep.* viii. 13. 47). Böckh, p. 149 sq. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graec. fragm.* p. 285 sq.

6. Ten verses of the comic poet Philemon on the certain punishment of even hidden sins by the all-knowing and just God (Οἷσι σὺ τοὺς θανόντας), and ten verses of Euripides on the same theme ("Ἀφθονον βίου μῆκος"), *De monarchia*, c. 3 (Otto's *Corp. apolog.* iii. 136-140). Part of the Euripidean verses is genuine, the rest spurious (see Dindorf's note to Clemens and Nauck). In Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 121 = Euseb. *Praep.* xiii. 13. 47, both pieces are attributed to the comic poet Diphilus. Theodoret, *Graec. affect. curatio*, c. vi. (*Opp.* ed. Schulze, iv. 854 sq.), also gives the text of Clemens in the extract. Valckenaer, *De Aristobulo*, pp. 1-8. Böckh, pp. 158-160. Meineke, *Fragm. comicorum Graec.* iv. 67. Nauck, *Tragic. Graec. fragm.* p. 496 sq.

7. Twenty-four verses of Philemon on the theme that a moral life is more needful and of more value than sacrifice (Ἐτίς μὲν θυσίαν προσφέρειν), *De monarchia*, c. 4 (Otto's *Corp. apol.* iii. 140 sq.). In Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 119-120 = Euseb. *Praep.* xv. xiii. 13. 45-46, the same verses are attributed to Menander. Böckh, p. 157 sq., thinks that the piece is based upon single genuine verses.

8. Among the other pieces cited from scenic poets in *De monarchia* and in Clement there are also a few more suspicious verses, which are introduced in *De monarchia*, c. 5 (Otto's *Corp. apol.* iii. 150 sq.), by the formula *Μένανδρος ἐν Διφίλῳ*. In Clemens, *Strom.* v. 14. 133 = Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xiii. 13. 62, they are ascribed to Diphilus. They summon to the worship of the one true God. Comp. Meineke, *Fragm. com. Graec.* iv. 429 sq. Perhaps too the verses of Sophocles in Clem. *Strom.* v. 14. 111 = Euseb. *Praep.* xiii. 13. 38, in which Zeus is represented in a very unflattering light, are also spurious. Comp. Nauck, *Tragic. Graec. fragm.* p. 285. Dindorf's note to Clemens.

9. Lastly, in this connection must be noticed the verses on the Sabbath, to which Aristobulus and Clement appeal, Aristobulus in Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xiii. 12. 13–16. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 87 = Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xiii. 13. 34. They are—(a) two verses of Hesiod; (b) three verses of Homer; (c) five verses of Linus, for whom Clement erroneously has Callimachus. The verses are a mixture of genuine and spurious. The divergences in the text between Clement and Aristobulus are but unimportant. Comp. Valckenaer, *De Aristobulo*, pp. 8, 10, 89–125. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 568. Schneider, *Callimachea*, vol. ii. Lips. 1873, p. 412 sq.

4. Hecataeus.

Hecataeus of Abdera (not to be confounded with the far more ancient geographer Hecataeus of Miletus about 500 B.C.) was according to Josephus a contemporary of Alexander the Great and of Ptolemy Lagos (Joseph. *c. Apion.* 22: *Ἐκαταῖος δὲ ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης, ἀνὴρ φιλόσοφος ἄμα καὶ περὶ τὰς πράξεις ἱκανώτατος, Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ συνακμάσας καὶ Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Λάγου συγγενόμενος*). This statement is also confirmed by other testimony. According to Diogenes, *Laert.* ix. 69, Hecataeus was a hearer of the philosopher Pyrrho, a contemporary of Alexander. According to Diodor. Sic. i. 46, he made, in the time of Ptolemy Lagos, a journey to Thebes. He was a philosopher and historian, and seems to have lived chiefly at the court of Ptolemy. A work on the Hyperboreans (Müller, *Fr.* 1–6), a History of Egypt (Müller, *Fr.* 7–13), and in Suidas' *Lex. s.v.* *Ἐκαταῖος*, a work, *περὶ τῆς ποιήσεως*

Ομήρον καὶ Ἑσιόδου, of which no other trace is found, are mentioned as his writings.

Under the name of this Hecataeus of Abdera there existed a book "*on the Jews*," or, as it is also entitled, "*on Abraham*," concerning which we have the following testimonies :— (1) Pseudo-Aristeas quotes Hecataeus as authority for the notion that profane Greek authors do not mention the Jewish law just because the doctrine held forth in it is a sacred one (Aristeas, ed. Mor. Schmidt in *Merx' Archiv.* i. 259 = Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 107: διὸ πόρρω γεγόνασιν οἳ τε συγγραφεῖς καὶ ποιηταὶ καὶ τὸ τῶν ἱστορικῶν πλήθος τῆς ἐπιμνήσεως τῶν προειρημένων βιβλίων, καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὰ πεπολιτευμένων καὶ πολιτευομένων ἀνδρῶν, διὰ τὸ ἀγνήν τινα καὶ σεμνήν εἶναι τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς θεωρίαν, ὥς φησιν Ἑκαταῖος ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης. See the passage also in Euseb. *Praep. ev.* viii. 3. 3, and more freely rendered in Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 2. 3). (2) Josephus says that Hecataeus not only incidentally alluded to the Jews, but also wrote a book concerning them (*contra Apion.* i. 22: οὐ παρέργως, ἀλλὰ περὶ αὐτῶν Ἰουδαίων συγγέγραφε βιβλίον; comp. i. 23: βιβλίον ἔγραψε περὶ ἡμῶν). He then gives in the same passage (*contra Apion.* i. 22 = Bekker's ed. vol. vi. pp. 202, 1–205, 22) long extracts from this work concerning the relations between the Jews and Ptolemy Lagos, their fidelity to the law, the organization of their priesthood, and the arrangement of their temple; lastly, a passage is given at the close in which Hecataeus relates an anecdote of which he was himself a witness at the Red Sea: a Jewish knight and archer, who belonged to the expeditionary corps, shot a bird dead, whose flight the augur was anxiously observing, and then derided those who were angry for their awe concerning a bird who did not even foreknow its own fate. Eusebius (*Praep. ev.* ix. 4) also gives single pieces from these extracts of Josephus. From the same source Josephus (*contra Apion.* ii. 4) gives the information that Alexander the Great bestowed upon the Jews the country of Samaria as a district exempt from taxation as a reward for their fidelity. While

according to all this there can be no doubt, that the book treated on the Jews in general, Josephus tells us in another passage, that Hecataeus not only mentions Abraham, but also wrote a book concerning him (*Antt.* i. 7. 2 = Euseb. *Praep. ev.* ix. 16: *μνημονεύει δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβράμου Βηρωσσός . . . Ἐκαταῖος δὲ καὶ τοῦ μνησθῆναι πλέον τι πεποίηκε βιβλίον γὰρ περὶ αὐτοῦ συνταξάμενος κατέλιπε*). Is this identical with the work on the Jews? To the decision of this question the two following pieces of testimony mainly contribute. (3) According to Clemens Alexandrinus, the spurious verses of Sophocles were contained in the work of Hecataeus *on Abraham and others* (Clem. Al. *Strom.* v. 14. 113 = Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xiii. 40: *ὁ μὲν Σοφοκλῆς, ὡς φησιν Ἐκαταῖος ὁ τὰς ἱστορίας συνταξάμενος ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἀβραμὸν καὶ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους, ἄντικρυς ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἐκβοᾷ*). (4) Origen says that Hecataeus in his work *on the Jews* was so strong a partisan for the Jewish people, that Herennius Philo (beginning of the second century after Christ)⁸⁸ at first doubted, in his work on the Jews, whether the work was indeed the production of Hecataeus the historian, but afterwards said that, if it were his, Hecataeus had been carried away by Jewish powers of persuasion, and had embraced their doctrines (Orig. *contra Cels.* i. 15: *καὶ Ἐκαταίου δὲ τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ φέρεται περὶ Ἰουδαίων βιβλίον, ἐν ᾧ προστίθεται μᾶλλον πως ὡς σοφῷ τῷ ἔθνει ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον, ὡς καὶ Ἐρέννιον Φίλωνα ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἰουδαίων συγγράμματι πρῶτον μὲν ἀμφιβάλλειν, εἰ τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ ἐστὶ τὸ σύγγραμμα· δεύτερον δὲ λέγειν, ὅτι, εἴπερ ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ, εἰκὸς αὐτὸν συνηρπᾶσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις πιθανότητος καὶ συγκατατεθεῖσθαι αὐτῶν τῷ λόγῳ*). According to these testimonies of Clement and Origen, there can be no doubt that the work "*on the Jews*" was as much forged by a Jew as that "*on Abraham*." We cannot therefore conclude,—as according to the extracts in Josephus we might feel inclined,—that the work on the Jews is genuine, and

⁸⁸ On Herennius Philo or Philo Byblius, see Müller, *Fragm. hist. Graec.* 560 sqq.

that on Abraham spurious. The two are on the contrary very probably identical, and the different titles to be explained by the circumstance that the work was indeed entitled *περὶ Ἀβράμου*, but dealt in fact *περὶ Ἰουδαίων*.

Certain however as is, especially according to the information of Origen, the spuriousness of the work "on the Jews," it is still probable that it is founded on *genuine portions of Hecataeus*. In the extracts of Josephus we already get a partial impression of genuineness. To this is to be added, that Diodorus Siculus gives a long portion from Hecataeus on the Jews, their origin, religious rites, political constitution, manners and customs, which from its whole tenor is certainly not derived from the pseudo-Jewish Hecataeus, but from the real Hecataeus, and indeed not as Diodorus mistakenly states from Hecataeus of Miletus, but from Hecataeus of Abdera.⁸⁴ It is thus probable, that the latter in his Egyptian history went into details concerning the Jews, and that the Jewish counterfeiter thence derived a portion of his material.

The scanty fragments are not sufficient to give us a clear idea of the design of the whole work. Since it dealt in the first instance with Abraham, it is probable that the life and acts of that patriarch served as the point of departure for a general description and glorification of Judaism. In this the honourable history of the Jews (*e.g.* the favour shown them by Alexander the Great and Ptolemy Lagos), as well as the purity of their religious ideas, were referred to. In the description of the latter, the forged verses of the Greek poets would be inserted, for the purpose of proving that the nobler Greeks also were quite in harmony with the views of Judaism (see the preceding section). The work seems to have been tolerably extensive and to have contained much genuine as well as spurious material from the Greek poets. It thus became a mine for subsequent Jewish and Christian apologists

⁸⁴ The passage of Diodorus here in question (from Book xl. of his larger work) has been preserved by Photius, *Biblioth. cod.* 244. See the wording also in Müller, *Fragm. hist. Graec.* ii. 391-393.

Its date of composition may be approximately determined. It is already cited by pseudo-Aristeas, who flourished not later than about 200 B.C. (see the next section). Thus pseudo-Hecataeus would have lived in the third century before Christ.

The fragments of both the real and the spurious Hecataeus of Abdera are collected in Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, ii. 384-396. Comp. in general: Hecataei Abderitae, *philosophi et historici Eclogae sive fragmenta integri olim libri de historia et antiquitatibus sacris veterum Ebraeorum graece et latine cum notis Jos. Scaligeri et commentario perpetuo P. Zornii*, Altona 1730. Eichhorn's *Allg. Bibliothek der bibl. Literatur*, v. 1793, pp. 431-443. Creuzer, *Historicorum graec. antiquiss. fragm.* (Heidelb. 1806) pp. 28-38. Kanngiesser in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgem. Encykl.* sec. ii. vol. v. (1829) p. 38 sq. Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie*, ii. 216-219. Cruice, *De Flavii Josephi in auctoribus contra Apionem afferendis fide et auctoritate* (Paris 1844), pp. 64-75. Vaillant, *De historicis, qui ante Josephum Judaicas res scripsere* (Paris 1851), pp. 59-71. Müller, *Fragm. hist. Graec. l.c.* Creuzer, *Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1853, pp. 70-72. Klein, *Jahrb. für class. Philol.* vol. lxxxvii. 1863, p. 532. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. 131 sqq., iv. 320 sq. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, pp. 165 sq., 178. J. G. Müller, *Des Flavii Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion* (1877), p. 170 sqq.

5. Aristeas.

The celebrated Epistle of Aristeas to Philocrates on the translation of the Jewish law into Greek also belongs to the class of writings under consideration. The legend related forms only the external frame of the statement. The whole is in truth a *panegyric upon Jewish law, Jewish wisdom and the Jewish name in general from the mouth of a heathen*. The two individuals Aristeas and Philocrates are not known to history. Aristeas in the narrative gives himself out as an official of King Ptolemy II. Philadelphus, and as held in high esteem by that monarch (ed. Mor. Schmidt in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 261. 13-14 and 262. 8-10 = Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii.

2. 108). Philocrates was his brother (Merx' *Archiv*, i. 254. 10, 275. 20-21 = Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 104, 115), an earnest-minded man, eager for knowledge and desiring to appropriate all the means of culture which the age afforded. It is self-evident that both were not Jews (Aristeas says of the Jews, 255. 34-256. 2: τὸν γὰρ πάντων ἐπόπτην καὶ κτίστην θεὸν οὗτοι σέβονται, ὃν καὶ πάντες, ἡμεῖς δὲ μάλιστα προσο- νομάζοντες ἐτέρως Ζῆνα καὶ Δία). Aristeas then relates to his brother Philocrates—and indeed as one who was both an eye-witness and assistant—the manner in which the translation of the Jewish law into Greek took place. The librarian Demetrius Phalereus called the attention of King Ptolemy II. Philadelphus (for it is he who is intended, p. 255. 6 and 17) to the fact that the law of the Jews was yet lacking in his great library, and that its translation into Greek was desirable for the sake of its incorporation in the royal collection of books. The king obeyed this suggestion and presently sent Andreas, the captain of his body-guard, and Aristeas to Jerusalem, to Eleazar the Jewish high priest with rich presents, and with the request that he would send him experienced men capable of undertaking this difficult task. Eleazar was ready to fulfil the king's desire and sent him seventy-two Jewish scholars, six from each of the twelve tribes. Aristeas then gives a full description of the splendid presents sent on the occasion by Ptolemy to Eleazar, also a description of the town of Jerusalem, of the Jewish temple, the Jewish worship, nay, of the land, all which he had himself seen on the occasion of this embassy. The whole description has evidently the tendency of glorifying the Jewish people, with their excellent institutions and luxuriant prosperity. With the same purpose does Aristeas then communicate the purport of a conversation, he had carried on with the high priest Eleazar concerning the Jewish law. Aristeas was, by reason of this conversation, so much persuaded of the excellency of the Jewish law, that he held it necessary to explain to his brother Philocrates "its holi-

ness and its naturalness (reasonableness)" (283. 12-13: *τὴν σεμνότητα καὶ φυσικὴν διάνοιαν τοῦ νόμου προῆγμαι διασαφῆσαι σοι*). Especially are the folly of idolatry and the reasonableness of the Jewish laws of purity thoroughly treated of. When the Jewish scholars arrived at Alexandria, they were received with distinguished honours by the king and were for seven days invited day after day to the royal table. During these repasts the king continually addressed to the Jewish scholars in turn a multitude of questions on the most important matters of politics, ethics, philosophy and prudence, which they answered so excellently, that the king was full of admiration for the wisdom of these Jews. Aristeas himself too, who was present at these repasts, could not contain himself for astonishment at the enormous wisdom of these men, who answered off-hand the most difficult questions, which with others usually require long consideration. After these festivities a splendid dwelling upon the island of Pharos, far from the tumult of the city, was allotted to the seventy-two interpreters, where they zealously set to work. Every day a portion of the translation was despatched in such wise, that by a comparison of what each had independently written, a harmonious common text was settled (306. 22-23: *οἱ δ' ἐπετέλουν ἕκαστα σύμφωνα ποιοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ταῖς ἀντιβολαῖς*). The whole was in this manner completed in seventy-two days. When it was finished, the translation was first read to the assembled Jews, who acknowledged its accuracy with expressions of the highest praise. Then it was also read to the king, who "was much astonished at the intelligence of the lawgiver" (308. 8-9: *λίαν ἐξεθαύμασε τὴν τοῦ νομοθέτου διάνοιαν*), and commanded, that the books should be carefully preserved in his library. Lastly the seventy-two interpreters were dismissed to Judea, and rich presents for themselves and the high priest bestowed upon them.

This survey of the contents shows, that *the object of the narrative is by no means that of relating the history in the*

abstract, but the history so far as it shows, what esteem and admiration were felt for the Jewish law and for Judaism in general by even heathen authorities, such as King Ptolemy and his ambassador Aristeas. For the tendency of the whole culminates in the circumstance, that praise was accorded to the Jewish law by *heathen* lips. The whole is therefore in the first place intended for *heathen* readers. They are to be shown what interest the learned Ptolemy, the promoter of science, felt in the Jewish law, and with what admiration his highly placed official Aristeas spoke of it and of Judaism in general to his brother Philocrates. When then it is also remarked at the close, that the accuracy of the translation was acknowledged by the Jews also, this is not for the purpose of commending the translation to Jews, who might still oppose it, but to testify to the heathen, that they had in the present translation an accurate version of the genuine Jewish law, and it is *they*, the heathen, who are thus invited to read it.

No consensus concerning *the date* of this book has been arrived at by critics. It seems however tolerably certain to me, that it originated not later than about 200 years before Christ. The legend, that it was Demetrius Phalereus who suggested the whole undertaking to Ptolemy Philadelphus is unhistorical, not only in its details, but in the main point; for Demetrius Phalereus in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus no longer lived at court at Alexandria (see above, p. 161). When then the Jewish philosopher Aristobulus designates just Demetrius Phalereus as the originator of the undertaking (in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 12. 2, see the passage above, p. 160), it is very probable that the book in question was already in his hands. Now Aristobulus lived in the time of Ptolemy Philometor, about 170–150 B.C., and the result thus obtained is supported on internal grounds also. The period when the Jewish people were leading a peaceful and prosperous existence under the conduct of their high priest and in a relation of very slight dependence upon Egypt, *i.e. the*

period before the conquest of Palestine by the Seleucidae, evidently forms the background of the narrative. There is nowhere any allusion to the complications and difficulties which begin with the Seleucidian conquest. The Jewish people and their high priest appear as almost politically independent. At all events it is to a time of peace and prosperity that we are transferred. Especially is it worthy of remark, that *the fortress of Jerusalem is in the possession of the Jews* (Merx' *Archiv*, i. 272. 10 to 273. 4 = Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 113). Whether this stood on the same spot as the one subsequently erected by Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc. i. 33) or not, the author is in any case acquainted with only the one in the possession of the Jews. The fortress however erected by Antiochus remained in the possession of the Seleucidae till the time of the high priest Simon (142–141 B.C., 1 Macc. xiii. 49–52). Of this fact the author has evidently as yet no knowledge, and as little of the subsequent princely position of the high priest; to him the high priest is simply the high priest, and not also prince or indeed king. In every respect then it is the circumstances of the Ptolemaic age that are presupposed. If the author has only artificially reproduced them, this is done with a certainty and a refinement which cannot be assumed in the case of a pseudonymous author living after it. Hence the opinion, that the book originated not later than 200 B.C., is justified.⁸⁵

The legend of this book has been willingly accepted and frequently related by Jews and Christians. The first who betrays an acquaintance with it is Aristobulus in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 12. 2. The next is Philo, *Vita Mosis*, lib. ii. § 5–7

⁸⁵ It may also be mentioned, that Mendelssohn (*Jenaer Literaturzeitung*, 1875, No. 23) places the composition in the first half of the first century before Christ, because it is said of the Jewish land that it had "good harbours" (ἀμύνας εὐχαίρους), viz. Ascalon, Joppa, Gaza, Ptolemais (Merx' *Archiv*, 272. 23 sqq. = Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 114). This presupposed the union of these seaport towns with the Jewish land by Alexander Jannaeus. But Ascalon and Ptolemais were never united at all to the Jewish district, not even by Alexander Jannaeus. Hence the inference is inconclusive. The notion of Grätz, that pseudo-Aristeas wrote under Tiberius (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums*, 1876, pp. 289 sqq., 337 sqq.), is worth as much as many others of this scholar's fancies.

(ed. Mangey, ii. 138–141). Josephus reproduces, *Antt.* xii. 2, a great portion of this composition almost verbally. Comp. also *Antt. proem.* 3, *contra Apion.* ii. 4, *fin.* In rabbinic literature also are found some echoes, though quite confused ones, of this legend. See Lightfoot, *Opp.* ed. Roterod. ii. 934 sqq. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (1851), p. 25 sqq. Berliner, *Targum Onkelos* (1884), ii. 76 sqq.

The passages of the Fathers and Byzantines are most conveniently found collected (with full verbal correctness) in Gallandi, *Bibliotheca veterum patrum*, vol. ii. (Venetiis 1788) pp. 805–824. The legend is here reproduced with various modifications, especially the two following:—1. That the interpreters translated independently of each other and yet verbally coincided (the exact opposite of which is found in Aristeas, viz. that agreement was only obtained by comparison). 2. That not only the law but the entire Holy Scriptures were translated by the seventy-two (in Aristeas only the former is dealt with). See on the various forms of the legend: Eichhorn's *Repertorium für bibl. und morgenländ. Literatur*, i. (1777) p. 266 sqq., xiv. (1784) p. 39 sqq. The passages given in Gallandi are the following: Justin. *Apol.* i. 31. *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 71. Pseudo-Justin. *Cohortatio ad Graec.* c. 13. Irenaeus, *adv. haer.* iii. 21. 2 (Greek in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* v. 8. 11 sqq.). Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 22. 148 sq. Tertullian. *Apologet.* c. 18. Anatolius in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 32. 16. Eusebius gives in his *Praeparatio evangelica*, viii. 2–5 and 9, large portions of the book of Aristeas verbatim; comp. also viii. 1. 8, ix. 38. *Chronic.* ed. Schoene, ii. 118 sq. (*ad ann. Abrah.* 1736). Cyrill. *Hieros. cateches.* iv. 34. Hilarius, *Pictav. prolog. ad librum psalmodum.* The same, *tractat. in psalmum* ii., *tractat. in psalmum* cxviii. Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus*, § 3, 6, 9–11 (fully and specially). Hieronymus, *Praefat. in version. Genes.* (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ix. 3 sq.). The same, *Praefat. in librum quaestion. hebraic.* (Vallarsi, iii. 303). Augustinus, *De civitate dei*, xviii. 42–43. Chrysostomus, *Orat. i. adversus Judaeos.* The same, *homil. iv. in Genes.* Theodoret, “*praefat. in psalmos.*” Pseudo-Athanasii *Synopsis scripturae sacrae*, c. 77. Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topograph. christ.* lib. xii. Joannes Malala, *Chronogr.* lib. viii. ed. Dindorf, p. 196. *Chronicon paschale*, ed. Dindorf, i. 326. Georgius Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 516–518. Georgius Cedrenus, ed. Bekker, i. 289 sq. Joannes Zonaras, *Annal.* iv. 16 (after Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 2). The five last-named are contained in the Bonn *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae*.

On the manuscripts of this book of Aristeas, comp. Moriz Schmidt in Merx' *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des alten Testaments*, i. 244 sqq.; and especially Lumbroso,

Recherches sur l'économie politique de l'Egypte sous les Lagides (Turin 1870), p. 351 sqq. The latter specifies seven other manuscripts besides the two Parisian ones compared by Moriz Schmidt.

On the *editions* (and translations), see Fabricius, *Biblioth. græc.* ed. Harles, iii. 660 sqq. Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur der bibl. Kritik und Exegese*, vol. ii. (1798) p. 344 sqq. Moriz Schmidt's above-named work, p. 241 sqq. Lumbroso's above-named work, p. 359 sqq. The *editio princeps* of the Greek text was issued by Oporinus in Basle 1561. The book has since been often reprinted in Havercamp's edition of *Josephus* and elsewhere (ii. 2, pp. 103–132), and in Gallandi's *Bibliotheca patrum* (ii. 773–804). Much however remains to be done for the establishment of a critical text. Moriz Schmidt has taken a first step towards it by his edition in Merx' *Archiv für wissenschaftl. Erforschung des alten Testaments*, vol. i. (1869) pp. 241–312, for which two Parisian manuscripts were compared.

The older literature on *Aristeas* is specified by Rosenmüller as above, ii. 387–411; also in Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i. 51–53. Comp. especially: Hody, *Contra historiam Aristeae de LXX. interpretibus dissertatio*, Oxon. 1685. The same, *De biblicorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Græcis et Latina vulgata*, Oxon. 1705 (in this larger work the earlier dissertation is reprinted and enriched with notes). Van Dale, *Dissertatio super Aristeae de LXX. interpretibus*, Amstelaed. 1705. Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur der bibl. Kritik und Exegese*, vol. ii. (1798) pp. 358–386. Gfrörer, *Philo*, ii. 61–71. Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandr. Rel.-Philosophie*, ii. 205–215. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge der Juden*, p. 125. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, i. 263 sq., iii. 545–547. Frankel, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1858, pp. 237–250, 281–298. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 322 sqq. Hitzig, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, p. 338 sqq. Nöldeke, *Die alttestamentliche Literatur* (1868), pp. 109–116. Cobet in *Δόγιος Ἐρμῆς ἐκδ. ὑπὸ Κόντου*, vol. i. (Leyden 1866) pp. 171 sqq., 177–181. Kurz, *Aristeae epistula ad Philocratem*, Bern 1872 (comp. *Literar. Centralbl.* 1873, No. 4). Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, pp. 110–112, 124 sq., 141–143, 149 sq., 162–165, 203 sq. Grätz, "Die Abfassungszeit des Pseudo-Aristeas" (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1876, pp. 289 sqq., 337 sqq.). Papageorgios, *Ueber den Aristeas-brief*, München 1880 (comp. Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1881, p. 380 sq.). Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), § 515. The introductions to the Old Testament of Jahn, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Herbst, Scholz, Hävernack, De Wette-Schrader, Bleek, Keil, Reusch, Kaulen.

6. *Phocylides.*

Phocylides of Miletus, the old composer of apothegms, lived (according to the statements in Suidas, *Lex. s.v. Φωκυλίδης*, and Euseb. *Chron. ad Olymp.* 60, ed. Schoene, ii. 98) in the sixth century before Christ. Few of his genuine sayings have been preserved. He must however have been held as an authority in the department of moral poetry. For in the Hellenistic period a didactic poem (ποίημα νοουθετικόν) was interpolated in his work by a Jew (or Christian?) giving in 230 hexameters moral instruction of the most diversified kind. Having frequently been used as a school-book in the Byzantine period, it has been preserved in many manuscripts and often printed since the sixteenth century. The contents of these verses are almost exclusively ethical. It is but occasionally that we find the one true God and the future retribution also referred to. The moral doctrines, which the author inculcates, extend to the most various departments of practical life, somewhat in the manner of Jesus the son of Sirach. *In their details however they coincide most closely with the Old Testament, especially with the Pentateuch*, echoes of which are heard throughout in the precepts on civil relations (property, marriage, pauperism, etc.). Even such special precepts are found here as that which enjoins, that when a bird's nest is taken, only the young ones must be kept, but the mother let fly (Deut. xxii. 6, 7 = Phocylides, vers. 84-85), or that the flesh of animals killed by beasts of prey may not be eaten (Deut. xiv. 21; Ex. xxii. 30 = Phocylides, vers. 139, 147-148). There can thus be no doubt, that the author was either a Jew or a Christian. The former is the prevailing opinion since the fundamental investigation of Bernays; Harnack has recently advocated the latter.⁸⁶ Both

⁸⁶ In the notice of Bernays' "Gesammelten Abhandlungen" in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1885, p. 160. Harnack chiefly relies upon ver. 104, where it is said of the risen, that they "afterwards become gods" (ὁπίσω δὲ θεοὶ τελέθονται). This is certainly a specifically Christian view, which Bernays gets rid of by changing θεοί into νῆες.

views have their difficulties. For there is nothing in the work either specifically Jewish or specifically Christian. The author designedly ignores the Jewish ceremonial law, and even the Sabbatic command, which is more striking here than in the Sibyllines, because the author in other respects enters into the details of the Mosaic law. On the other side there is no kind of reference to Christ, nor above all to any religious interposition for salvation. It is just bare morality which is here preached. Hence a *certain* decision as to the Jewish or Christian origin of the poem is scarcely possible. The scale against the Christian origin of the poem seems to me especially turned by the fact, that the author's moral teaching coincides only with the Old Testament and not with the moral legislation of Christ, as we have it in the synoptists. Of the latter there is in this poem, as far as I can see, no certain traces. And this is scarcely conceivable in a Christian author, who means to preach morality. If at the same time there are still single expressions or propositions in the poem, which betray a Christian hand (like *θεοί*, ver. 104), they must be set to the account of the Christian tradition, and how freely this dealt with the text is shown us by the portion, which by some chance or other got into the collection of the Sibyllines (*Sibyll.* ii. 56–148 = Phocylides, 5–79). The text as there presented diverges pretty much from that elsewhere handed down and plainly shows the hand of a Christian reviser.

If then this poem is of Jewish origin, it is of especial interest just through its lack of anything specifically Jewish. The design of the author is first of all to labour only for Jewish morality. He has not even the courage to speak strongly against idolatry. The two fundamental religious notions of Judaism, the unity of God and the future retribution, are indeed to be found in him also, and he indirectly advocates them. But he does it in so reticent a manner as to make it evident that morality occupies the first place in his regards. His Judaism is even paler than that of Philo.

For the *date of composition* no other limits can be laid

down than those which are given for Judaeo-Hellenistic literature in general. It could not have appeared later than the first century after Christ, and in all probability considerably earlier. It might seem strange that it is not cited by Christian apologists, by a Clement or a Eusebius, who use so much else of this kind.⁸⁷ But the strangeness disappears as soon as we consider the object for which such quotations are made, viz. in the first place to produce heathen testimony to the *religious* ideas of Christianity, to the notions of the unity of God and the future retribution, and these were not expressed in Phocylides as forcibly as could be desired.

The most careful monograph on this poem is Bernays, *Ueber das Phokylideische Gedicht, ein Beitrag zur hellenistischen Litteratur*, Breslau 1856 (reprinted in Bernays, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, published by Usener, 1885, vol. i. pp. 191–261). The text of the poem with critical apparatus is best given in Bergk, *Poetae lyriici Graeci*, vol. ii. (3rd ed. 1866) pp. 450–475 (the same, pp. 445–449, also the fragment of the genuine Phocylides). Bernays as above gives the text according to his own recension. On the older editions, especially in the collections of gnomic writers, see Schier in his separate edition, Lips. 1751. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. Graec.* i. 704–749. Eckermann, art. "Phokylides," in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgem. Encyclopädie*, § 3, vol. xxiv. (1848) p. 485. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 96 sqq. The separate edition: Phocylidis, etc., *carmina cum selectis adnotationibus aliquot doct. virorum Graece et Latine, nunc denuo ad editiones praestantissimas rec. Schier*, Lips. 1751, must be brought forward. A German translation is given by Nickel, *Phokylides Mahngedicht in metrischer Uebersetzung*, Mainz 1833.

Comp. in general: Wachler, *De Pseudo-Phocylide*, Rinteln 1788. Rohde, *De veterum poetarum sapientia gnomica, Hebraeorum imprimis et Graecorum*, Havn. 1800. Bleek, *Theol. Zeitschr.*, edited by Schleiermacher, de Wette and Lücke, i. 1819, p. 185 (in the article on the Sibyllines). Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie*, ii. 222 sq. Eckermann, art. "Phokylides," in Ersch and Gruber's *Allg. Encyklop.* § 3, vol. xxiv. (1848) pp. 482–485. Teuffel in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* v. 1551. Alexandre's 1st ed. of the *Oracula Sibyllina*, ii. 401–409. Bernhardt, *Grundriss der griechischen*

⁸⁷ The first traces of its being used are found in Stobaeus and in certain classic scholia. See Bernhardt, *Grundriss der griechischen Litteratur*, ii. 1 (3rd ed. 1867), p. 520.

Litteratur, ii. 1 (3rd ed. 1867), pp. 517–523. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vi. 405, 412. Freudenthal, *Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift über die Herrschaft der Vernunft* (1869), p. 161 sqq. Leop. Schmidt's notice of Bernays' work in the *Jahrbb. für class. Philol.* vol. lxxv. (1857) pp. 510–519. Goram, "De Pseudo-Phocylide" (*Philologus*, vol. xiv. 1859, pp. 91–112). Hart, "Die Pseudophokylideia und Theognis im codex Venetus Marcianus 522" (*Jahrbb. für class. Philol.* vol. xcvi. 1868, pp. 331–336). Bergk, "Kritische Beiträge zu dem sog. Phokylides" (*Philologus*, vol. xli. 1882, pp. 577–601). Sitzler, "Zu den griechischen Elegikern" (*Jahrbb. für class. Philol.* vol. cxxix. 1884, p. 48 sqq.). Phocylides, *Poem of Admonition*, with introd. and commentaries by Feuling, trans. by Goodwin, Andover, Mass. 1879. Still more literature in Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 96 sqq.; and in Engelmann's *Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum*, ed. Preuss.

7. *Smaller Pieces perhaps of Jewish Origin under Heathen Names.*

1. *Letters of Heraclitus?*—Epistolography was a favourite kind of literature in the later times of antiquity. The letters of eminent rhetoricians and philosophers were collected as a means of general culture. Letters were composed and also feigned under the names of famous persons, and generally for the purpose of furnishing entertaining and instructive reading. To the numerous species of the latter kind belong also nine supposed letters of Heraclitus, to which Bernays has devoted very thorough research. In two of them, the fourth and seventh, he thinks he can recognise the hand of "a believer in Scripture," and indeed in such wise, that the fourth is merely interpolated, but the seventh entirely composed by such an one. In fact the austere polemic against the worship of images in the fourth letter sounds quite Jewish or Christian, as does also the stern morality preached in the seventh, in which especially the partaking of "live" flesh, *i.e.* flesh with the blood, is denounced (τὰ ζῶντα κατεσθίετε; comp. on the Jewish and Christian prohibition, Acts xv. 29, and Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 318). It must however, as Bernays himself

acknowledges, remain a question, whether this "believer in the Scriptures" was a Jew or a Christian.

Bernays, *Die heraklitischen Briefe, ein Beitrag zur philosophischen und religionsgeschichtlichen Litteratur* (Berlin 1869), pp. 26 sqq., 72 sqq., 110 sq. Bernays gives also the text of the letters with a German translation. The latest edition of the *Epistolographi* in general is Hercher, *Epistolographi Graeci recensuit*, etc., Paris, Didot, 1873. A separate edition of the letters of Heraclitus: Westermann, *Heracliti epist. quae feruntur*, Lips. 1857 (*Universitäts-progr.*). Comp. on the entire epistolographic literature, Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* i. 166-703. Nicolai, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, 2nd ed. ii. 2 (1877), p. 502 sqq.

2. *A letter of Diogenes?*—Among the fifty-one supposed letters of Diogenes, Bernays thinks that one, the twenty-eighth, may be referred to the same source as the seventh of Heraclitus. In fact it contains a similar moral sermon to the latter.

Bernays, *Lucian und die Kyniker* (Berlin 1879), pp. 96-98. See the text in all the editions of the *Epistolographi*, e.g. in Hercher, *Epistolographi Graeci*, pp. 241-243.

3. *Hermippus?*—Hermippus Callimachus, who lived under Ptolemy III. and IV., and therefore in the second half of the third century before Christ, composed a large number of biographies of eminent persons. Among the pieces of information thence obtained, two arrest our attention. According to Origen, *contra Cels.* i. 15, it was said in the first book "on the lawgivers," that Pythagoras derived his philosophy from the Jews (*λέγεται δὲ καὶ Ἑρμιππον ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ νομοθετῶν ιστορικέῃ, Πυθαγόραν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φιλοσοφίαν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων εἰς Ἑλλήνας ἀγαγεῖν*). According to Josephus, *contra Apion.* i. 22, a similar remark was contained in the first book "on Pythagoras." The notice of Josephus is however much more particular and accurate than that of Origen. For according to Josephus, Hermippus relates, that Pythagoras taught "not to go over a place where an ass had sunk on his

knees, to abstain from turbid water and to avoid all slander and blasphemy," and on this Hermippus then remarked: "Pythagoras did and taught these things, imitating and adopting the opinions of the Jews and Thracians" (ταῦτα δ' ἔπραττε καὶ ἔλεγε τὰς Ἰουδαίων καὶ Θρακῶν δόξας μιμούμενος καὶ μεταφέρων εἰς ἑαυτόν). Thus Hermippus did not denote the philosophy of Pythagoras as a whole, but only those special doctrines as borrowed from the Jews. For the words which follow in Josephus: λέγεται γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐκείνος πολλὰ τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις νομίμων εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ μετενεγκεῖν φιλοσοφίαν, are no longer the words of Hermippus but of Josephus. In the reference of Josephus, the words of Hermippus contain nothing which he might not actually have written. It is otherwise with the reference of Origen. If this had been accurate we should have had to conclude, that a Jew had interpolated the work of Hermippus. But Origen himself intimates, that he had not seen the work of Hermippus; he says only: "Hermippus is said to have declared." It is most probable, that he is here relying solely on the passage of Josephus, which he reproduces but incorrectly. Thus we have here not a Jewish forgery but only an inaccurate reference of Origen to authenticate.

C. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iii. 35-54, has admitted both passages among genuine fragments of Hermippus (*Fr.* 2 and 21). Comp. for and against their genuineness: Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie*, ii. 219 sq. Kellner, *De fragmentis Manethonianis* (1859), p. 42. Hilgenfeld, *Einkl. in das N. T.* p. 168, note. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyh.* pp. 178, 192. J. G. Müller, *Des Flavii Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion* (1877), p. 161 sqq.

4. *Numenius?*—The Pythagorean and Platonist Numenius (towards the end of the second century after Christ) as the genuine precursor of Neo-Platonism was acquainted with and after his fashion made use of the Jewish Scriptures, nay of Jewish tradition (*e.g.* concerning Jannes and Jambres, see above, p. 149). Origen bears decided testimony to this, when he says, *contra Cels.* iv. 51, that he knows that Numenius

quotes "in many passages of his works sayings of Moses and the prophets, and convincingly explains them in an allegorical manner, as *e.g.* in the so-called Epops, in the books on numbers and in those on space" (ἐγὼ δ' οἶδα καὶ Νουμήνιον . . . πολλαχοῦ τῶν συγγραμμάτων αὐτοῦ ἐκτιθέμενον τὰ Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ οὐκ ἀπιθάνως αὐτὰ τροπολογοῦντα, ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ καλουμένῳ "Ἐποπι καὶ ἐν τοῖς "περὶ ἀριθμῶν" καὶ ἐν τοῖς "περὶ τόπου"). Comp. also Orig. *c. Cels.* i. 15; Zeller, *Philos. d. Griechen*, iii. 2. 217 sq. We have no reason to mistrust this testimony. It is not however credible, that Numenius should have used just this expression: τί γάρ ἐστι Πλάτων ἢ Μωυσῆς ἀττικίζων, which Clemens Alex. and others attribute to him.⁸⁸ If it really stood in a work of Numenius, it would certainly have to be laid to the account of a Jewish editor. We see however the real state of affairs from Eusebius, who only says, that this saying is ascribed to Numenius, viz. by oral tradition.⁸⁹ The saying then is *not a Jewish forgery*, but only an exaggeration due to oral tradition of the real view of Numenius.

Comp. on this question: Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyhistor*, p. 173, note. On Numenius in general: Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881), pp. 216–223.

5. *Hermes Trismegistus*?—The god Hermes, and that as Trismegistus, was first represented as an author by the Egyptians. According to Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 4. 37, there were forty-two books of Hermes, thirty-six of which contained the entire philosophy of the Egyptians, the other six were devoted to medicine. Tertullian, *de anima*, c. 2 and 33, is already acquainted with books of Mercurius Aegyptius, which taught a Platonizing psychology. From the latter circumstance it is seen, that the later Platonists especially had already taken posses-

⁸⁸ Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 22. 150. Hesychius Miles. in Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iv. 171. Suidas, *Lex. s.v.* Νουμήνιος.

⁸⁹ Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xi. 10. 14, ed. Gaisford: Εἰκότως δῆτα εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκείνο τὸ λόγιον περιφέρεται, δι' οὗ φάναι μνημονεύεται, τί γάρ ἐστι Πλάτων ἢ Μωυσῆς ἀττικίζων;

sion of this pseudonym. Thus then the works of Hermes which have come down to us, are of Neo-Platonic origin. They are first cited by Lactantius, and were probably of the third century after Christ. Their position with respect to the heathen popular religions is a thoroughly positive one. "Just the defence of national and particularly of Egyptian religion is one of their chief objects" (Zeller, iii. 2. 234 sq.). But all the pieces are not the work of one author, nor are they even all of heathen origin. *Neither can the co-operation of Jewish hands in the production of this literature be proved.* On the contrary, what is not of heathen seems to be of Christian origin (c. 1 and 13 of the so-called Poemander).

Comp. on this whole literature: Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* i. 46-94. Bähr in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iii. 1209-1214. Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Gesch. der Philosophie*, i. (4th ed. 1871) p. 256. Erdmann, *Grundriss der Gesch. der Philos.* 3rd ed. 1878, vol. i. pp. 179-182. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881), pp. 224-235. Erdmann and Zeller did not enter into a thorough description of the Hermes works till the more recent editions of their works as cited above.

§ 34. PHILO THE JEWISH PHILOSOPHER.

I. THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF PHILO.

*The Literature.*¹

Mangey's edition of the works of Philo, the Prolegomena and especially the notes prefixed to the several works.

Fabricius, *Bibliotheca graeca*, ed. Harles, vol. iv. (1795) pp. 721-750.

Scheffer, *Quaestionum Philonianarum part I. sive de ingenio moribusque Judaeorum per Ptolemaeorum saecula*, Marburgi 1829. Idem, *De usu Philonis in interpretatione Novi Testamenti*, Marburgi 1831.

Gfrörer, *Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie*, vol. i. (1831) pp. 1-113.

Creuzer, "Zur Kritik der Schriften des Juden Philo" (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1832, pp. 3-43).

Dähne, "Einige Bemerkungen über die Schriften des Juden Philo" (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1833, pp. 984-1040). Idem, art. "Philon" in Ersch and Gruber's *Allg. Encyklopädie*, § 3, vol. xxiii. (1847) pp. 435-454.

Grossman, *De Philonis Judaei operum continua serie et ordine chronologico* Comment. Pts. i. ii. Lips. 1841-1842.

Steinhart, art. "Philo" in Pauly's *Real-Enc. der class. Alterthumswissensch.* vol. v. (1848) p. 1499 sq.

J. G. Müller, art. "Philo" in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. xi. (1859) pp. 578-603. Idem, *Ueber die Texteskritik der Schriften des Juden Philo*, Basel 1839 (printed in J. G. Müller, *Des Juden Philo Buch von der Weltschöpfung*, 1841, pp. 17-45).

Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, 3rd ed. vol. vi. (1868) pp. 257-312.

Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Gesch. der Philosophie*, 4th ed. i. (1871) pp. 240-249.

¹ The literature here named refers only to Philo as an author in general. For the literature on Philo's doctrine, see No. II. below. For the literature on his several works, see in the places where they are treated of. Still more literature is given in: Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, iv. 721 sqq. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 87-94. Engelmann, *Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum* (8th ed. revised by Preuss), vol. i. 1880, pp. 546-548.

- Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. vol. ii. (1875) pp. 131-182.
- Delaunay, *Philon d' Alexandrie, écrits historiques, influence lutttes et persécutions des juifs dans le monde romain*, 2nd ed. Paris 1870.
- Treitel, *De Philonis Judaei sermone*, Bresl. 1872 (30 pp.).
- Siegfried, *Die hebräischen Worterklärungen des Philo und die Spuren ihrer Einwirkung auf die Kirchenväter* (37 pp. gr. 4), 1868. Idem, "Philonische Studien" (Merx's *Archiv für Erforschung des A. T.* ii. 2, 1872, pp. 143-163). Idem, "Philo und der überlieferte Text der LXX." (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1873, pp. 217 sqq., 411 sqq., 522 sqq.). Idem, *Zur Kritik der Schriften Philo's* (Ebendas. 1874, p. 562 sqq.).
- Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des Alten Testaments an sich selbst und nach seinem geschichtlichen Einfluss betrachtet. Nebst Untersuchungen über die Gräcität Philo's*, Jena 1875.
- Nicolai, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, 2nd ed. ii. 2 (1877), pp. 653-659.
- Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vol. iii. (3rd ed. 1878) pp. 678-683.
- Bernh. Ritter, *Philo und die Halacha, eine vergleichende Studie*, Leipzig 1879.
- Reuss, *Geschichte der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), § 566-568.
- Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, vol. ii. (1883) arts "Philo" and "Religionsphilosophie."
- Zöckler, art. "Philo" in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xi. (1883) pp. 636-649.

Among Jewish Hellenists none other, besides Josephus, takes so eminent a position as Philo the Alexandrian. Even by reason of the extent of his works, which have been handed down, he is one of the most important *to us*. Of no other can we form even approximately, so clear a picture of his thoughts, and literary and philosophic labours. But he is also in himself evidently the most illustrious among all those, who strove to unite Jewish belief with Hellenic culture, to be the means of imparting to Jews the cultivation of the Greeks, and to Greeks the religious knowledge of the Jews. No other Jewish Hellenist was so fully saturated with the wisdom of the Greeks; no other enjoyed equal consideration in history. This is testified by the immense influence which he exercised upon after times and above all upon Christian theology the inheritor of the Judaeo-Hellenistic.²

² On the consideration enjoyed by Philo in antiquity, comp. especially Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 4. 3: *πλείστοις ἀνὴρ οὐ μόνον τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἔξωθεν ὁρμωμένων παιδείας ἐπιστημώτατος.*

We have but a few scanty notices concerning his life. The assertion of Jerome, that he was of priestly race,³ has no support from older sources, nor does Eusebius know anything of it. According to Josephus⁴ he was a brother of the Alabarch Alexander, and consequently a member of one of the most aristocratic families of Alexandrian Jews.⁵ The sole event in his life, which can be chronologically fixed, is his participation in the embassy to Caligula in A.D. 40, of which he has himself furnished an account in the work *De Legatione ad Cajum*. As he was then of advanced age⁶ he may have been born about the year 20–10 B.C. The Christian legend, that he met St. Peter at Rome in the reign of Claudius, is of no historical value.⁷

Much has been lost of Philo's numerous works. But thanks to his being a favourite with the Fathers and Christian theologians the bulk of them has been preserved. Of the collective editions that of Mangey is, notwithstanding its deficiencies, the most valuable.⁸ Among recent contributions

³ *De viris illustribus*, c. 11 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ii. 847): Philo Judaeus natione Alexandrinus, de genere sacerdotum.

⁴ *Antt.* xviii. 8. 1.

⁵ Ewald (*Gesch.* vi. 259) and Zeller (*Philos. der Griechen*, 3rd ed. iii. 2. 339) have of late incorrectly rejected the statement of Josephus and declared Philo to have been the uncle of Alexander, because a nephew of Philo named Alexander is mentioned in the work published by Aucher, *De ratione animalium*, pp. 123 sq., 161 (in the 8th vol. of Ritter's edition). But it is nowhere said in it that this Alexander was the Alabarch.

⁶ He designates himself (*Legat. ad Cajum*, § 28, ed. Mangey, ii. 572) as φρονεῖν τι δοκῶν περιττότερον καὶ δι' ἡλικίαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην παιδείαν. In the beginning of his work composed shortly after (§ 1, Mang. ii. 572) he calls himself γέρον.

⁷ Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 17. 1. Hieronymus, *De viris illustr.* c. 11 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ii. 847). Photius, *Bibliotheca cod.* 105. Suidas, *Lex. s.v.* Φίλων (verbally according to the Greek translation of Jerome).

⁸ On the editions of Philo's works (or of separate parts) and of the translations, comp. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. gr.* iv. 746–750. S. F. W. Hoffmann, *Lexicon bibliogr.* vol. iii. p. 231 sqq. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 87–92. Graesse, *Trésor de livres rares et précieux*, vol. v. (1864) pp. 269–271. The editio princeps is: Φίλωνος Ἰουδαίου εἰς τὰ του Μωσέως κοσμοποιήματα, ιστορικά, νομοθετικά. Του αὐτου μονοβιβλία. *Philonis Judaei in libros Mosis de mundi opificio, historicos, de legibus. Ejusdem libri singulares*

the works of Philo preserved only in Armenian, published by Aucher, are by far the most important.⁹ Greek portions of greater or less extent were given by Mai,¹⁰ Grossmann,¹¹ and

Ex bibliotheca regio, Parisiis, ex officina Adriana Turnebi, 1552 fol. Several publications of Höschel at first contributed to the completion of this very imperfect edition (Francof. 1587, Augustae Vindel. 1614). Collective editions appeared also at Geneva 1613 fol., Paris 1640 fol., Frankfort 1691 fol. (the Frankfort edition is only a reprint of the Parisian with identical paging). The edition of Mangey, 2 vols. London 1742 fol., marks an important advance. It is the first which is based upon a more extensive comparison of the manuscripts and is also more complete than any former one. The edition of Pfeiffer, vols. i.-v. Erlangen 1785-1792, 2nd ed. 1820, remained unfinished (it contains only what stands in Mangey vols. i. and ii. 1-40). On the deficiencies in the editions of Mangey and Pfeiffer, see Creuzer, *Stud. und Krit.* 1832, pp. 5-17. J. G. Müller, *Ueber die Texteskritik der Schriften des Juden Philo*, Basel 1839, p. 5 sqq. (printed in J. G. Müller, *Des Juden Philo Buch von der Welterschöpfung*, 1841, p. 18 sqq.).

⁹ They appeared in two vols. under separate titles: (1) *Philonis Judaei sermones tres hactenus inediti, i. et ii. de providentia et iii. de animalibus, ex Armino versione etc. nunc primum in Latium [sic] fideliter translati per Jo. Bapt. Aucher, Venetiis 1822.* (2) *Philonis Judaei paralipomena Armena, libri videlicet quatuor in Genesin, libri duo in Exodum, sermo unus de Sampsonem, alter de Jona, tertius de tribus angelis Abraamo apparentibus, opera hactenus inedita ex Armena versione etc. nunc primum in Latium fideliter translata per Jo. Bapt. Aucher, Venetiis 1826.*

¹⁰ The works here in question are: (1) *Philo et Virgilii interpretes.* In it *Philonis Judaei de cophini festo et de colendis parentibus cum brevi scripto de Jona*, editore ac interprete Angelo Maio, Mediolan. 1818. (2) *Classicorum auctorum e Vaticanis codicibus editorum*, vol. iv. curante Angelo Maio, Romae 1831 (contains: pp. 402-407, *Philonis de cophini festo*; pp. 408-429, *Philonis de honorandis parentibus*; pp. 430-441, *Philonis ex opere in Exodum selectae questiones*). (3) *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis codicibus*, edita ab Angelo Maio, vol. vii. Romae 1833 (contains, Pt. I. pp. 74-109, specimens from a Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes with numerous smaller fragments of Philo). (4) *Philonis Judaei, Porphyrii philosophi, Eusebii Pamphili opera inedita.* In it: *Philonis Judaei de virtute ejusque partibus*, ed. Ang. Maius, Mediolan. 1816 (this work, which in the Milan manuscript used by Mai bears the name of Philo, is in other manuscripts attributed to Gemistus Pletho, and was long printed under his name, as Mai himself subsequently remarked). See *Leipziger Literaturzeitung*, 1818, No. 276.

¹¹ Grossmann, *Anecdoton Graecum Philonis Judaei de Cherubinis Exoa.* xxv. 18, Lips. 1856 (this supposed *Anecdoton* from the *cod. Vat. n. 379* was already printed in the year 1831 in Mai, *Classicorum auctorum*, vol. iv. pp. 430-441. Tischendorf indeed knew nothing of it in 1868, comp. his *Philonea*, p. xix. sq.).

Tischendorf.¹² Pitra has communicated material of various kinds from manuscripts.^{12a} In the more recent hand editions these publications have been at least partially turned to account.¹³ A satisfactory collective edition is however as yet wanting. That planned long since by Grossmann has not been carried into execution.¹⁴ For a new edition, ■ careful investigation also of the material offered by the as yet un-

¹² Tischendorf, *Anecdota sacra et profana* (2nd ed. Lips. 1861), pp. 171-174. But especially Tischendorf, *Philonea, inedita altera, altera nunc demum recte ex vetere scriptura eruta*, Lips. 1868. Holwerda in the *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der koninkl. Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde, tweede reeks derde deel*, Amsterdam 1873, pp. 271-288, gives emendations of Tischendorf's text. Idem, *Derde reeks eerste deel*, 1884, pp. 274-286.

^{12a} Pitra, *Analecta sacra spicilegio Solesmensi parata*, vol. ii. (1884) pp. xxii. sq., 304-334. Pitra here gives: (1) Philo-fragments from the Florilegium of the *codex Coislinianus* 276 (pp. 304-310). (2) Philo-fragments from various Vatican MSS. (pp. 310-314). (3) A list of the Philo-manuscripts in the Vatican Library, together with a list of the several works of Philo contained in these manuscripts (pp. 314-319). (4) Information concerning various ancient and modern Latin translations of Philo (pp. 319-334).

¹³ The hand edition of Richter (8 vols. Lips. 1828-1830) contains besides the text of Mangey the two publications of Aucher and those of Mai of the year 1818. The same texts are also in the Tauchnitz stereotype edition (8 vols. Lips. 1851-1853). On recent editions of separate works of Philo (*De opificio mundi*, by J. G. Müller, *De incorruptibilitate mundi*, by Bernays), see below at the proper places. I may also mention that a number of Philo's writings translated into German will be found in the *Bibliothek der griechischen und römischen Schriftsteller über Judenthum und Juden in neuen Uebersetzungen und Sammlungen*, vol. i. Leipzig 1865 [vol. ii. contains *Josephus*], vol. iii. 1870, vol. iv. 1872.

¹⁴ Grossmann publicly expressed his intention so long ago as 1829 (*Quaestiones Philoneae*, i. p. 7). Afterwards Tischendorf in particular collected materials for him, comp. *Anecdota sacra et profana*, p. 171: Quam Grossmannus longissimo ex tempore novam operum scriptoris istius gravissimi editionem praeparat, ea ex collationibus meis codicum fere triginta ubique terrarum dispersorum non modo apparatus habebit locupletissimum et textum prioribus editionibus multo correctiorem, verum etiam aucta erit ineditis nonnullis quae in Italia reperire mihi contigit. On the manuscripts of Philo, comp. the Prolegomena in Mangey's edition, Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. gr.* iv. 743-746. Tischendorf, *Philonea*, pp. vii.-xx. Some notices in Mai, *Nova patrum bibliotheca*, vi. 2, p. 67, note. A list of the Vatican manuscripts in Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, ii. p. 314, and at pp. 316-319, accurate information as to the manuscripts in which each separate work of Philo is contained.

printed Florilegia (collections of extracts from the Fathers and more ancient authors) would be necessary.¹⁵

A tolerably complete catalogue of Philo's works is already given by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History.¹⁶ Unfortunately however it is in such disorder as to afford no foothold for the correct classification of the works. In this respect we are almost exclusively referred to the contents

¹⁵ The best known among the extant printed Christian Florilegia are those of Maximus Confessor, Johannes Damascenus and Antonius Melissa. In all three Philo is frequently quoted (see the indexes in Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. gr.* ix. pp. 663, 731, 756). To the same category belong also the Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes in Mai, *Script. vet. nova collectio*, vii. 1. 74-109. Mangey has collected from Johannes Damascenus (*Sacra parallela*) and Antonius Melissa all those passages which are derived from lost works of Philo (*Philonis opp.* ii. 648-660, 670-674). But what Mangey here gives under the name of Johannes Damascenus really comes from two different collections. For Lequien gives in his edition of Johannes Damascenus first (ii. 274-730) the complete text of the *Sacra parallela*, but then also (ii. 730-790) a selection of passages from another and considerably divergent recension of the *sacra parallela*, which is also attributed to Johannes Damascenus. The latter (in a *codex Rupefucaldinus* of the Jesuit College, Paris) seems to me however exactly identical with the so-called *Johannes Monachus ineditus*, extracts of which from lost works of Philo are given by Mangey himself after the supposed extracts from Johannes Damascenus (*Philonis opp.* ii. 660-670). For both manuscripts belong to the Jesuit College at Paris and have exactly the same superscription (Lequien, ii. 274 sq., 731; Mangey, i. p. xviii. sq. and ii. 660). Seeing the importance of the so-called *Johannes Monachus ineditus* in the criticism of Philo, the matter deserved a more accurate investigation. Pitra (*Analecta sacra*, ii. 304-310) has given various fragments from Philo from a third recension of the *Sacra parallela* in the *cod. Coislinianus* 276. Many similar collections of extracts moreover exist in manuscript, which have not as yet been turned to any account with respect to Philo. See Fabricius-Harles, *Bibl. gr.* ix. 720 sq., 758 sq. Comp. on this literature in general: Fabricius-Harles, ix. 635-759. Nicolai, *Griech. Literaturgesch.* vol. iii. 1878, pp. 309-318. Wachsmuth, *Studien zu den griechischen Florilegien*, Berlin 1882. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentl. Kanons*, Pt. iii. (1884) pp. 7-10.

¹⁶ Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 18. The statements of Jerome, *De viris illustr.* c. 11 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ii. 847 sq.), rest entirely upon this catalogue of Eusebius. Again the catalogue in Suidas (*Lex. s.v. Φίλων*) is copied with only a few additions of his own from the Greek translation of Jerome. Photius, *Bibliotheca cod.* 103, 104, 105 on the other hand gives somewhat that is independent. Comp. in general the *testimonia veterum* in Mangey, i. pp. xxi.-xxix. The long fragments from different works of Philo in the *Praep. evang.* of Eusebius are also especially valuable.

of the works themselves, a careful consideration of which evidently shows, that they by no means form so unconnected a mass, as appears from the titles in the editions. The great majority are on the contrary only sub-divisions of some few large works. And indeed, as especially Ewald has correctly perceived, *three chief works on the Pentateuch* may be distinguished, which alone embrace more than three-quarters of what has come down to us as Philo's.¹⁷

I. The *Ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις*, *Quaestiones et solutiones*, which first became more widely known through the publications of Aucher from the Armenian, are a comparatively brief *catechetical explanation of the Pentateuch in the form of questions and answers*. It is not easy to ascertain how far they extended. In the time of Eusebius, they were extant for only Genesis and Exodus (*H. E.* ii. 18. 1 and 5) and such other traces as may be regarded as certain extend only to these two books.¹⁸ The explanation of Genesis comprised probably *six books*, at all events only so much can be certainly pointed out from the quotations.¹⁹ The explanation of *Exodus* comprised, according to the testimony of Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 18. 5) and Jerome, *five books*.

¹⁷ More or less valuable contributions to the correct classification of Philo's works have been furnished by Mangey, Fabricius, Gfrörer, Dähne, Grossmann, Ewald and Siegfried in the above-named works and articles (Siegfried in the *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1874, p. 562 sqq.). The arbitrarily got up surveys of J. G. Müller and Zöckler are on the contrary useless. Steinhart and Hamburger are also inaccurate. Hausrath, ii. 152–154, does the most for confusion.

¹⁸ Grossmann (*De Phil. Jud. operum continua serie*, i. p. 25) and Ewald (*Gesch.* vi. 294 sq.) suppose, that the work extended to the three last books of the Pentateuch also. In Mai, *Script. vet. nova collectio*, vii. 1, p. 104^a, is indeed found a fragment *ἐκ τῶν ἐν τῷ λευιτικῷ ζητημάτων*. But sometimes errors occur in these quotation formulae also.

¹⁹ Three fragments *ἐκ τοῦ ε' τῶν ἐν γενέσει ζητημάτων* (Mai, *Script. vet. nova collectio*, vii. 1, pp. 100^b, 106^b, 108^b.) occur in the Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes. In Le Quien's edition of Johannes Damascenus, ii. 362, note, it is remarked, that a fragment there given is introduced in the *cod. Rupefucaldinus* (see above, note 15) by the formula *ἐκ τοῦ ε' τῶν αὐτῶν* (scil. *τῶν ἐν γενέσει ζητουμένων*). All other known quotations refer to Books i.–v. Only once in Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1. 99^b, is found *ἐκ τοῦ θ' τῶν ἐν γενέσει ζητημάτων*, where however E must certainly be read for Θ.

Of these are preserved (1) in the *Armenian* tongue about the half of these eleven books, viz. four on Genesis (incomplete) and two on Exodus (also imperfect);²⁰ and (2) a large fragment (comprising about half of the fourth book on Genesis) in an old *Latin* translation, which was repeatedly printed in the beginning of the sixteenth century, but entirely ignored by the publishers of the Greek works.²¹ Lastly (3) in *Greek* numerous small fragments still awaiting collection.²² By the

²⁰ Published in Armenian and Latin by Aucher, 1826 (see above, note 9). After this in Latin also in Richter, *Philonis opp.* 6 and 7 vols., and in the Tauchnitz stereotype edition (also in 6 and 7 vols.). On the gaps, comp. Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1833, p. 1038.

²¹ *Philonis Judaei centum et duae quaestiones et totidem responsiones super Genesim*, Paris 1520, fol. (Fabricius-Harles, iv. 746). The Giessen University library possesses: *Philonis Judaei Alexandrini, libri antiquitatum, quaestionum et solutionum in Genesim, de Essaeis, de nominibus Hebraicis, de mundo*, Basileae 1527, fol. (in which, pp. 61–83: *Philonis Judaei quaestionum et solutionum in Genesim liber*). There are also impressions of 1538 and 1550 (Fabricius, *l.c.*). Aucher, pp. 362–443 (under the Armenio-Latin text), and Richter, vii. 212–261, follow the impression of 1538. Manuscripts also of this Latin text are still known, two Vatican (Vatican 488 and Urbin 61) and one Laurentianus; see thereon Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, ii. 298 sq., 314, 332. On the age and character of the translation, Pitra, *Analecta*, ii. 298 sq., 319 sqq.

²² Of *Greek* fragments are known: (1) A small piece: *ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου τῶν Φίλωνος Ζητημάτων καὶ λύσεων*, on Genesis in Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* vii. 13. (2) The fragment *De Cherubinis* on Exodus, published by Mai, Grossmann and Tischendorf (Mai, *Classicorum auctorum*, vol. iv. pp. 430–441; Grossmann, *Anecdota*, etc. 1856; Tischendorf, *Philonea*, pp. 144–153). (3) Numerous small fragments from Johannes Damascenus, *Johannes Monachus ineditus*, Antonius Melissa and the Catena of the cod. Paris, Reg. n. 1825, in Mangey, *Philonis opp.* ii. 648–680. Of these certainly it is only the fragments in the *codex Rupefucaldinus* and in *Johannes Monachus ineditus*, Mang. ii. 653–670 (both probably identical, see above, note 15), that are expressly traced to the *ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις*. But many others, especially those in the Catena, come from it. (4) About thirty to forty small fragments in the Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes, in Mai, *Script. vet. nova collectio*, vii. 1. 96–109. (5) A portion also of the small fragments edited by Tischendorf (*Anecdota sacra et profana*, pp. 171–174; *Philonea*, pp. 152–155) are probably derived from this work. (6) Six small fragments in the Florilegium of the *codex Coislinianus* in Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, ii. 307 sq. Various other fragments from Vatican manuscripts also in Pitra, *Analecta*, ii. 310–314 (a portion at least of these fragments must certainly be included). (7) A more accurate investigation of the Florilegia,

help of the Armenian text it is now settled, that many passages have been taken almost verbally from this work, without mention of Philo's name, by the Fathers and especially by Ambrose.²³ The composition of these *Quaestiones et solutiones* is in some parts of earlier in other of later date, than that of the large allegorical commentary, as is shown by the allusions to each other in both works.²⁴

II. While this shorter explanation in a catechetical form was intended for more extensive circles, Philo's special and chief scientific work is his *large allegorical commentary on Genesis*, *Νόμων ιερῶν ἀλληγορίαι* (such is the title given it in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 18. 1, and Photius, *Bibliotheca cod.* 103. Comp. also Origen, *Comment. in Matth.* vol. xvii. c. 17; *contra Celsum*, iv. 51).²⁵ These two works frequently approximate each other as to their contents. For in the *Quaestiones et solutiones* also, the deeper allegorical signification is given as well as the literal meaning. In the great allegorical commentary on the contrary, the allegorical interpretation exclusively prevails. The deeper allegorical sense of the sacred letter is settled in extensive and prolix discussion, which by reason of the copious adducting of parallel passages often seems to wander from the text. Thus the entire exegetic method, with its dragging in of the most hetero-

especially of those not as yet edited (see note 15), would furnish considerable gain in the matter of small fragments.

²³ Numerous passages from Ambrose are reprinted in Aucher under the Armenio-Latin text. Comp. on the use of Philo by Ambrose generally: Siegfried, *Philo*, pp. 371-391. Förster, *Ambrosius Bischof von Mailand* (1884), pp. 102-112.

²⁴ Ewald (*Gesch.* vi. 294) regards the *Quaestiones et solutiones* as older than the large allegorical commentary. Dähne (*Stud. und Krit.* 1833, p. 1037) considers it more recent. For a more minute discussion, see Grossmann, *De Phil. Jud. operum continua serie*, ii. pp. 14-17.

²⁵ In the quotations in the Florilegia *ἀλληγορία* is always in the singular, e.g. in *Johannes Monachus ineditus ἐκ τοῦ α' τῆς νόμων ιερῶν ἀλληγορίας*, ἐκ τοῦ δ' τῆς νόμων ιερῶν ἀλληγορίας (both in Mangey, ii. 668). So too in the Florilegium of the *codex Coislinianus* (Pitra, *Analecta sacra*), ii. 306, and in that of Leontius and Johannes (Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1, pp. 95^b, 96^a, 98^b, 99^b, 100^a, 102^a, 105^a, 107^a, 107^b).

geneous passages in elucidation of the idea supposed to exist in the text, forcibly recalls the method of Rabbinical Midrash. This allegorical interpretation however has with all its arbitrariness, its rules and laws, the allegorical meaning as once settled for certain persons, objects and events being afterwards adhered to with tolerable consistency. Especially is it a *fundamental thought*, from which the exposition is everywhere deduced, *that the history of mankind as related in Genesis is in reality nothing else than a system of psychology and ethic*. The different individuals, who here make their appearance, denote the different states of soul (τρόποι τῆς ψυχῆς) which occur among men. To analyse these in their variety and their relations both to each other and to the Deity and the world of sense, and thence to deduce moral doctrines, is the special aim of this great allegorical commentary. Thus we perceive at the same time, that Philo's chief interest is *not*—as might from the whole plan of his system be supposed—speculative theology for its own sake, but on the contrary psychology and ethic. To judge from his ultimate purpose he is not a speculative theologian, but a psychologist and moralist (comp. note 183).

The commentary at first follows the text of Genesis verse by verse. Afterwards single sections are selected, and some of them so fully treated, as to grow into regular monographs. Thus *e.g.* Philo takes occasion from the history of Noah to write two books on drunkenness (περὶ μέθης), which he does with such thoroughness, that a collection of the opinions of other philosophers on this subject filled the first of these lost books (Mangey, i. 357).

The work, as we have it, begins at Gen. ii. 1: *Καὶ ἐτελέσθησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ*. The creation of the world is therefore not treated of. For the composition, *De opificio mundi*, which precedes it in our editions, is a work of an entirely different character, being no allegorical commentary on the history of the creation, but a statement of that history itself. Nor does the first book of the *Legum allegoriarum* by

any means join on to the work *De opificio mundi*; for the former begins at Gen. ii. 1, while in *De opif. mundi*, the creation of *man* also, according to Gen. ii., is already dealt with. Hence—as Gfrörer rightly asserts in answer to Dähne—the allegorical commentary cannot be combined with *De opif. mundi* as though the two were but parts of the same work. At most may the question be raised, whether Philo did not also write an allegorical commentary on Gen. i. This is however improbable. For the allegorical commentary proposes to treat of the history of *mankind*, and this does not begin till Gen. ii. 1. Nor need the abrupt commencement of *Leg. alleg.* i. seem strange, since this manner of starting at once with the text to be expounded, quite corresponds with the method of Rabbinical Midrash. The later books too of Philo's own commentary begin in fact in the same abrupt manner. In our manuscripts and editions only the first books bear the title belonging to the whole work, *Νόμων ιερῶν ἀλληγορίαι*. All the later books have special titles, a circumstance which gives the appearance of their being independent works. In truth however *all that is contained in Mangey's first vol.*—viz. the works which here follow—belongs to the book in question (with the sole exception of *De opificio mundi*).

1. *Νόμων ιερῶν ἀλληγορίαι πρῶται τῶν μετὰ τὴν ἑξαήμερον.* *Legum allegoriarum liber i.* (Mangey, i. 43–65). On Gen. ii. 1–17.—*Νόμων ιερῶν ἀλληγορίαι δεύτεραι τῶν μετὰ τὴν ἑξαήμερον.* *Legum allegoriarum liber ii.* (Mangey, i. 66–86). On Gen. ii. 18–iii. 1^a. — *Νόμων ιερῶν ἀλληγορίαι τρίται τῶν μετὰ τὴν ἑξαήμερον.* *Legum allegoriarum liber iii.* (Mangey, i. 87–137). On Gen. iii. 8^b–19.—The titles here given of the first three books, as customary in the editions since Mangey,²⁶ require an important correction. Even the different extent of Books i. and ii. leads us to conjecture, that they may properly be but *one* book. In fact Mangey remarks

²⁶ I do not give the Latin titles exactly according to Mangey, but as they are usually quoted.

at the commencement of the third book (i. 87, note): in omnibus codicibus opusculum hoc inscribitur ἀλληγορία δευτέρα. Thus we have in fact but two books. There is however a gap between the two, the commentary on Gen. iii. 1^b–8^a being absent. The commentary too on Gen. iii. 20–23 is wanting, for the following book begins with Gen. iii. 24. As Philo in these first books follows the text step by step, it must be assumed, that each of the two pieces was worked up into a book by itself, and this is even certain with respect to the second.²⁷ Hence the original condition was very probably as follows: Book i. on Gen. ii. 1–3, 1^a, Book ii. on Gen. iii. 1^b–3, 8^a, Book iii. on Gen. iii. 8^b–19, Book iv. on Gen. iii. 20–23. With this coincides the fact, that in the so-called *Johannes Monachus ineditus*, the commentary on Gen. iii. 8^b–19 is indeed more often quoted as τὸ γ' τῆς τῶν νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας (Mangey, i. 87, note). When on the other hand the same book is entitled in the MSS. ἀλληγορία δευτέρα, this must certainly be explained as showing that the actual second book was already missing in the archetype of these manuscripts.

2. Περὶ τῶν Χερουβὶμ καὶ τῆς φλογίνης ῥομφαίας καὶ τοῦ κτισθέντος πρώτου ἐξ ἀνθρώπου Κάιν. *De Cherubim et flammeo gladio* (Mangey, i. 138–162). On Gen. iii. 24 and iv. 1. From this point onwards the several books have been handed down no longer under the general title νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι, but under special titles. According to our conjecture as above, this book would be the *fifth*, unless it formed the *fourth* together with the commentary on Gen. iii. 20–23.

3. Περὶ ὧν ἱεουργοῦσιν Ἀβελ τε καὶ Κάιν. *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* (Mangey, i. 163–190). On Gen. iv. 2–4. In the *codex Vaticanus* the title runs: Περὶ γενέσεως Ἀβελ καὶ

²⁷ The remark in *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, § 12, *fin.* (i. 171, Mang.): τί δέ ἐστι τὸ τὴν γῆν ἐργάζεσθαι, διὰ τῶν προτέρων βίβλων ἐδηλώσαμεν, can refer only to the missing commentary on Gen. iii. 23. Comp. Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1863, p. 1015. Grossmann indeed (i. p. 22) thinks it relates to the book *De agricultura*, which was certainly a later composition.

ὡν αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ Κάιν ἱερουργοῦσιν. Frequently quoted in *Johannes Monachus ineditus* with the formula 'Ἐκ τοῦ περὶ γενέσεως Ἀβελ (see Mangey, i. 163, note). Also in the Florilegium of the *codex Coislinianus*.^{27a} The missing commentary on Gen. iv. 5-7 would have formed either the conclusion of this book, or a separate book.

4. Περὶ τοῦ τὸ χεῖρον τῷ κρείττονι φιλεῖν ἐπιτίθεσθαι. *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat* (Mangey, i. 191-225). On Gen. iv. 8-15. The book is already quoted by Origen under this special title (*Comm. in Matth.* vol. xv. c. 3). Eusebius mistakenly quotes under the same title several passages belonging to *De confusione linguarum* (*Praep. Ev.* xi. 15). In the Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes several passages are cited from our book with the formula ἐκ τοῦ ζ καὶ η τῆς νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας.²⁸ Also in *Johannes Monachus ineditus* (Mangey, i. 191, note). The unusual formula ἐκ τοῦ ζ καὶ η must surely mean, that the seventh book was according to another computation also called the eighth (ἐκ τοῦ ζ τοῦ καὶ η would thus be the more accurate).²⁹ This book then is according to the usual numbering the seventh, but was, in consequence of *De opificio mundi* being placed first, also called the eighth.

5. Περὶ τῶν τοῦ δοκησισόφου Κάιν ἐγγόνων καὶ ὡς μεταβάσσης γίνεται. *De posteritate Caini sibi visi sapientis et quo pacto sedem mutat* (Mangey, i. 226-261). On Gen. iv. 16-25. This book was first published by Mangey from the *cod. Vat.* 381. Much more correctly from the same manuscript by

^{27a} Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, ii. 308 sq.

²⁸ The following passages are cited with this formula: 1. Κυρίως οὔτε ἐπὶ χρημάτων ἢ κτημάτων περιουσία οὔτε ἐπὶ δόξης λαμπρότητι κ.τ.λ. Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1, p. 96a = Mangey, i. 217, *med.* 2. 'Εν ᾧ μὲν ψυχῇ τὸ ἐκτὸς αἰσθητὸν ὡς μέγιστον ἀγαθὸν τετίμηται, ἐν ταύτῃ λόγος ἀσώτῃς οὐχ εὑρίσκεται κ.τ.λ. Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1, p. 107a = Mangey, i. 192, *init.* The same formula is also found 3. *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1, p. 102a (where of course ζ καὶ η must be read for ζ καὶ ιγ); and 4. The same, p. 107b. The former passage is in the beginning of *De posteritate Caini* (Mang. i. 228); I have not succeeded in discovering the latter

²⁹ Comp. Dähne, *Stud. und Kritik.* 1833, p. 1015.

Tischendorf, *Philonea*, pp. 84–143. Holwerda gave emendations in 1884 (see note 12 above). This book is in like manner as the former quoted with the formula *ἐκ τοῦ η καὶ θ τῆς νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας* in Leontius and Johannes,³⁰ in the Florilegium of the *codex Coislinianus*,^{30a} and in *Johannes Monachus ineditus* (Mangey, i. 226, note).

Of these books none is mentioned by its special title in the catalogue of Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* ii. 18, while all that follow are quoted under these titles, evidently because Eusebius considers the former to be included and the latter not included in the joint title *νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι*. To this must be added, that in the Florilegia also, the quotations under the general title extend exactly thus far. *It is therefore highly probable, that Philo issued the following books only under the special titles.*³¹ Nay, it is also evident why this was done, viz. *because from this point onwards the uninterrupted text was no longer commented on, but only selected passages.* The exegetic method is however quite the same in the following books.

6. *Περὶ γιγάντων*. *De gigantibus* (Mangey, i. 262–272). On Gen. vi. 1–4.—*Ὅτι ἄτρεπτον τὸ θεῖον*. *Quod deus sit immutabilis* (Mangey, i. 272–299). On Gen. vi. 4–12. These two paragraphs, which are in our editions separated, form together but *one* book. Hence Johannes Monachus ineditus cites passages from the latter paragraph with the formula *ἐκ τοῦ περὶ γιγάντων* (Mangey, i. 262, note, 272, note).

³⁰ Two passages: 1. Παιδείας σύμβολον ἡ ἀβάβδος· ἄνευ γὰρ τοῦ δυσωπῆναι (*sic*) καὶ περὶ ἐνίων ἐπιπληχθῆναι, νουθεσίαν ἐνδέξασθαι καὶ σαφρονισμόν, ἀμύχανον κ.τ.λ. Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1, p. 99^b = Mangey, i. 243. —2. Πέφυκεν ὁ ἄφρων ἐπὶ μηδενὸς ἐστάναι παγίως καὶ ἐνερίσθαι δόγματος· ἄλλοτε γοῦν ἀλλοῖα δοξάζει . . . Καὶ ἐστὶν αὐτῷ πᾶσα ἡ ζωὴ κρεμαμένη βᾶσιν ἀκράδαντον οὐκ ἔχουσα κ.τ.λ. Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1, p. 100 = Mangey, i. 230–231.

^{30a} Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, vol. ii. (1884) p. 306. The two passages here given by Pitra are in Mangey, i. 230 above and 253 (*de posteritate Caini*, § 6 and 43).

³¹ In answer to Dähne, *Stud. und Kritik*. 1833, pp. 1019–1024. Ersch and Grüber's *Enc.*, art. "Philo," p. 442.

Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 4: *περὶ γυγάντων ἥ* [elsewhere *καὶ*] *περὶ τοῦ μὴ τρέπεσθαι τὸ θεῖον.*

7. *Περὶ γεωργίας.* *De agricultura* (Mangey, i. 300–328). On Gen. ix. 20^a.—*Περὶ φυτουργίας Νῶε τὸ δεύτερον.* *De plantatione Noe* (Mangey, i. 329–356). On Gen. ix. 20^b. The common title of these two books is properly *περὶ γεωργίας*. Comp. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 2: *περὶ γεωργίας δύο.* Hieronymus, *De vir. illustr.* 11: *de agricultura duo.* Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* vii. 13. 3 (ed. Gaisford): *ἐν τῷ περὶ γεωργίας προτέρῳ.* *Ibid.* vii. 13. 4: *ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ.*

8. *Περὶ μέθης.* *De ebrietate* (Mangey, i. 357–391). On Gen. ix. 21. From the beginning of this book it is evident that another book preceded it, in which *τὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις φιλοσόφοις εἰρημμένα περὶ μέθης* were stated. This first book is lost, but was still extant in the time of Eusebius, Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 2: *περὶ μέθης τосαῦτα* (viz. two). Hieronymus, *vir. illustr.* 11: *de ebrietate duo.* They seem to have been in the hands of Johannes Monachus ineditus in the reverse order. For what he quotes with the formula *ἐκ τοῦ περὶ μέθης α'*, is found in that which has come down to us; while what he cites with the formula *ἐκ τοῦ περὶ μέθης δευτέρου λόγου*, is not found in it (Mangey, i. 357, note).

9. *Περὶ τοῦ ἐξένηψε Νῶε.* *De sobrietate* (Mangey, i. 392–403). On Gen. ix. 24.—In the best manuscripts (*Vaticanus* and *Mediceus*) the title runs: *περὶ ὧν ἀνανήψας ὁ νοῦς εὐχεται καὶ καταρᾶται* (Mangey, i. 392, note). Almost exactly the same, Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 2: *περὶ ὧν νήψας ὁ νοῦς εὐχεται καὶ καταρᾶται.* Hieronymus, *vir. illustr.* 11: *de his quae sensu precamur et detestamur.*

10. *Περὶ συγχύσεως διαλέκτων.* *De confusione linguarum* (Mangey, i. 404–435). On Gen. xi. 1–9.—The same title also in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 2. In the *Praep. evang.* xi. 15, Eusebius quotes several passages from it with the mistaken statement, that they are from: *Περὶ τοῦ τὸ χεῖρον τῷ κρείττονι φιλεῖν ἐπιτίθεσθαι.*

11. *Περὶ ἀποικίας.* *De migratione Abrahami* (Mangey, i

436-472). On Gen. xii. 1-6.—The same title also in Eusebius, *H. E.* ii. 18. 4.

12. *Περὶ τοῦ τίς ὁ τῶν θείων πραγμάτων κληρονόμος.* *Quis rerum divinarum haeres sit* (Mangey, i. 437-518). On Gen. xv. 1-18.—Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 2: *περὶ τοῦ τίς ὁ τῶν θείων ἐστὶ κληρονόμος ἢ περὶ τῆς εἰς τὰ ἴσα καὶ ἐναντία τομῆς.* Hieronymus, *vir. illustr.* 11, makes from this double title the two works: *De haerede divinarum rerum liber unus, De divisione aequalium et contrariorum liber.* Suidas, *Lex. s.v. Φίλων*,^{31a} also follows him. Johannes Monachus ineditus quotes this book with the formula *ἐκ τοῦ τίς ὁ τῶν θείων κληρονόμος* (Mangey, i. 473, note). When he likewise quotes it with the formula *ἐκ τοῦ περὶ κοσμοποιίας* (Mangey, *l.c.*), we must not conclude from this, that the latter was a general title, which was applied to this book as well as others,³² for we have here simply an error in quotation. In the commencement of this book a former composition is referred to in the words: *Ἐν μὲν τῇ πρὸ ταύτης βίβλῳ περὶ μισθῶν ὡς ἐνῆν ἐπ' ἀκριβείας διεξήλθομεν.* This composition is not lost as Mangey supposed (see his note on the passage), but is the book *περὶ ἀποικίας*, which in fact treats *περὶ μισθῶν*.³³ We see at the same time, that Gen. xiii.-xiv. was not commented on by Philo.

13. *Περὶ τῆς εἰς τὰ προπαιδεύματα συνόδου.* *De congressu quaerendae eruditionis causa* (Mangey, i. 519-545). On Gen. xvi. 1-6.—In Eusebius, *H. E.* ii. 18. 2, the title runs: *περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὰ παιδεύματα συνόδου.* But the *προπαιδεύματα*, which has come down in the Philo-manuscripts is preferable, for the fact, that Abraham cohabited with Hagar, before he had issue by Sarah, means according to Philo, that we must become acquainted with propaedeutic knowledge before we can rise to the higher wisdom and obtain its fruit, namely,

^{31a} Comp. also Grossmann, i. p. 24, on the fact of the two titles belonging to the same book.

³² Mangey, i. 473, note. Comp. Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1833, p. 1000 sqq.

³³ Dähne, 1018 sq. Grossmann, i. p. 22.

virtue. Comp. also Philo's own allusion in the beginning of the following book (*de profugis*): *Εἰρηκότες ἐν τῷ προτέρῳ τὰ πρόποντα περὶ τῶν προπαιδευμάτων καὶ περὶ κακώσεως κ.τ.λ.*

14. *Περὶ φυγάδων.* *De profugis* (Mangey, i. 546–577). On Gen. xvi. 6–14.—Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 2: *περὶ φυγῆς καὶ εὐρέσεως*.³⁴ And exactly so Johannes Monachus ineditus: *ἐκ τοῦ περὶ φυγῆς καὶ εὐρέσεως* (Mangey, i. 546, note). This is without doubt the correct title. For the work deals with the flight and refinding of Hagar.

15. *Περὶ τῶν μετονομαζομένων καὶ ὧν ἕνεκα μετονομάζονται.* *De mutatione nominum* (Mangey, i. 578–619). On Gen. xvii. 1–22.—The same title in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 3. Johannes Monachus ineditus quotes under this title much that is not found in this book, nor in any of the preserved works of Philo (Mangey, i. 578, note). In this book Philo alludes to a lost work: *Τὸν δὲ περὶ διαθηκῶν σύμπαντα λόγον ἐν δυσὶν ἀναγέγραφα πράξεσι*, which was no longer extant in the time of Eusebius (comp. *H. E.* ii. 18. 3).^{34a}

16. *Περὶ τοῦ θεοπέμπτους εἶναι τοὺς ὀνείρους.* *De somniis*, lib. i. (Mangey, i. 620–658). On Gen. xxviii. 12 sqq. and xxxi. 11 sqq. (the two dreams of Jacob).—Lib. ii. of the same work (Mangey, i. 659–699). On Gen. xxxvii. and xl. 41 (the dreams of Joseph and of Pharaoh's chief butler and baker).—According to Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 4 and Hieronymus, *vir. illustr.* 11, Philo wrote *five books* on dreams. Thus three are lost. Those that have come down to us seem, to judge from their openings, to be the second and third. In any case our first was preceded by another, which probably treated on the dream of Abimelech,³⁵ Gen. xx. 3. Origenes, *contra Celsum*,

³⁴ The text of Eusebius was here very early corrupted. Jerome (*de natura et inventione*) already read *φυγῆς* instead of *φύσεως*. By continued corruption there then arose in Nicephorus the double title: *ὁ περὶ φυγῆς καὶ αἰρέσεως* ἔτι τε ὁ περὶ φύσεως καὶ εὐρέσεως, which monstrosity has been even admitted into the text of Eusebius by his recent editors.

^{34a} The allusion in the *Quæst. et solut. in Exodum*, ed. Aucher, p. 493, certainly relates to the same work. Comp. Grossmann, i. p. 25.

³⁵ Gfrörer, i. 43. Dähne, 1025. Grossmann, i. 25

vi. 21, *fin.*, already mentions the paragraph on Jacob's ladder, Gen. xxviii. 12 (contained in the first of the preserved books).

III. The third chief group of Philo's works on the Pentateuch is a *Delineation of the Mosaic Legislation for non-Jews*. In this whole group indeed, the allegorical explanation is still occasionally employed. In the main however we have here actual historical delineations, a systematic statement of the great legislative work of Moses, the contents, excellence and importance of which, the author desires to make evident to non-Jewish readers, and indeed to as large a circle of them as possible. For the delineation is more a popular one, while the large allegorical commentary is an esoteric, and according to Philo's notions a strictly scientific work. The contents of the several compositions forming this group differ indeed considerably, and are apparently independent of each other. Their connection however, and consequently the composition of the whole work, cannot, according to Philo's own intimations, be doubtful. As to plan it is divided into *three parts*. (a) The beginning and as it were the introduction to the whole is formed by a description of the creation of the world (*κοσμοποιία*), which is placed first by Moses for the purpose of showing, that his legislation and its precepts are in conformity with the will of nature (*πρὸς τὸ βούλημα τῆς φύσεως*), and that consequently he who obeys it is truly a citizen of the world (*κοσμοπολίτης*) (*de mundi orig.* § 1). This introduction is next followed by (b) *biographies of virtuous men*. These are, as it were, the living, unwritten laws (*ἐμφυχοὶ καὶ λογικοὶ νόμοι de Abrahamo*, § 1, *νόμοι ἀγραφοὶ de decalogo*, § 1), which represent, in distinction from the written and specific commands, universal moral norms (*τοὺς καθολικωτέρους καὶ ὡσὰν ἀρχετύπους νόμους de Abrahamo*, § 1). Lastly, the third part embraces (c) *the delineation of the legislation proper*, which is divided into two parts: (1) that of the ten chief commandments of the law, and (2) that of the special laws belonging to each of these ten commandments. Then follow by way of appendix a few treatises on certain

cardinal virtues, and on the rewards of the good and the punishments of the wicked. This survey of the contents shows at once, that it was Philo's intention to place before his readers a clear description of the entire contents of the Pentateuch, which should be in essential matters complete. His view however is in this respect the genuinely Jewish one, that these entire contents fall under the notion of the νόμος. The work begins with:

1. *Περὶ τῆς Μωϋσέως κοσμοποιίας. De mundi opificio* (Mangey, i. 1-42).—It was customary to place this work at the head of Philo's works, before the first book of the *Legum allegoriae*. And this position has been resolutely defended, especially by Dähne.³⁶ Gfrörer on the other hand already convincingly showed, that the book *de Abrahamo* must be immediately joined to *de mundi opificio*.³⁷ He has only erred in the matter of declaring this whole group of writings older than the allegorical commentary (p. 33 sq.). It was easy to show in reply, that this popular delineation of the Mosaic legislation is on the contrary more recent than the bulk of the allegorical commentary.³⁸ On the other hand there is nothing to prevent our relegating the work *de mundi opificio* also, to the more recent group. We have already shown, p. 331 above, that it is *not* connected with the allegorical commentary. On the contrary the beginning of the work *de mundi opificio* makes it quite evident that it was to form the introduction to the delineation of the legislation, and it is equally plain, that the composition *de Abrahamo* directly follows it. Comp. *de Abrahamo*, § 1: Ὁν μὲν οὖν τρόπον ἡ κοσμοποιία διατέτακται, διὰ τῆς προτέρας συντάξεως, ὡς οἶόν τε ἦν, ἠκριβώσαμεν. To refer this intimation to the whole series of the allegorical commentaries is, both by reason of the expression *κοσμοποιία* and of the singular *διὰ*

³⁶ Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1833, p. 1000 sqq. Ersch and Gruber's *Encyklop.* art. "Philon," p. 441. Comp. also Grossmann, ii. p. 6. J. G. Müller, *Des Juden Philo Buch von der Weltschöpfung*, pp. 13, 15 sqq. The same in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. xi. 581.

³⁷ Gfrörer, i. pp. 8-10.

³⁸ See especially Grossmann, ii. pp. 13, 14.

τῆς προτέρας συντάξεως, quite impossible. — But however certain all this is, the matter is not thus as yet settled. For on the other hand it is just as certain, that the composition *de mundi opificio* was subsequently placed at the head of the allegorical commentaries to compensate for the missing commentary on Gen. i. Only thus can it be explained that Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* viii. 13, quotes a passage from this composition with the formula (viii. 12, *fin.* ed. Gaisford): ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου τῶν εἰς τὸν νόμον.³⁹ It is just this which explains the transposition of this treatise into the catalogue of Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* ii. 18 (it was in his eyes comprised in the νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι), and also the peculiar form of citation: ἐκ τοῦ ζ καὶ η [resp. ἐκ τοῦ η καὶ θ] τῆς νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας, mentioned p. 333 above.—There still remains the question, whether this *supplementary* insertion of the *Legum allegoriae* between *de mundi opificio* and *de Abrahamo* originated with Philo himself? This is especially the view of Siegfried.⁴⁰ It seems to me however, that the reasons brought forward are not conclusive.⁴¹ J. G. Müller has lately

³⁹ Another quotation from this treatise is introduced in the *Praep. evang.* with the formula (xi. 23, *fin.* Gaisf.): λέγει δ' οὖν ὁ Ἑβραῖος Φίλων τὰ πατρια διερμηνεύων αὐτοῖς ῥήμασιν.

⁴⁰ *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1874, p. 562 sqq.

⁴¹ For this arrangement of Philo's writings ((1) Creation of the world, (2) Allegorical commentary, (3) Legislation) the following two passages have, since Dähne, been cited as conclusive: 1. *Vita Mosis*, ed. Mang. ii. 141, where it is said of the Holy Scriptures, which Moses composed: τὸ μὲν ἱστορικὸν μέρος, τὸ δὲ περὶ τὰς προσταξέας καὶ ἀπαγορεύσεις, ὑπὲρ οὗ δεύτερον λέξομεν, τὸ πρότερον τῇ τάξει πρότερον ἀκριβώσαντες. Ἔστιν οὖν τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ τὸ μὲν περὶ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσεως, τὸ δὲ γενεαλογικόν· τοῦ δὲ γενεαλογικοῦ τὸ μὲν περὶ κολάσεως ἀσεβῶν, τὸ δ' αὖ περὶ τιμῆς δικαίων. Philo here divides the contents of the Mosaic writings into only two chief groups, the *historical* and the *legislative*. When he then says, that he would treat of the latter after having already minutely treated of the former, it follows first only, that the delineation of the Mosaic legislation was later than the allegorical commentary (to which the expression with respect to the ἱστορικὸν μέρος probably refers; for the βίοι σοφῶν, which treat only of the good, not of both good and bad, cannot by any means be intended). When he next goes on to again divide the historical portion more particularly into two sections: (1) περὶ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσεως, (2) τὸ γενεαλογικόν, we may certainly infer, that the composition of *de mundi opificio*

brought out a separate edition of this composition with a commentary.⁴²

2. *Βίος σοφοῦ τοῦ κατὰ διδασκαλίαν τελειωθέντος ἡ περὶ τόμων ἀγράφων* [α'], ὃ ἐστὶ περὶ Ἀβραάμ. *De Abrahamo* (Mangey, ii. 1–40).—With this composition commences the group of the *νόμοι ἀγραφοί*, i.e. the *βίοι σοφῶν* (*de decalogo*, § 1), the biographies of virtuous men, who exhibit by their exemplary behaviour the universal types of morality. Of such types there are twice three, viz. (1) Enos, Enoch, Noah; (2) Abraham, Isaac, Jacob. Enos represents *ἐλπίς*, Enoch *μετάνοια καὶ βελτίωσις*, Noah *δικαιοσύνη* (*de Abrahamo*, § 2, 3, 5). The second triad is more exalted: Abraham is the symbol of *διδασκαλικὴ ἀρετή* (virtue acquired by learning), Isaac of *φυσικὴ ἀρετή* (innate virtue), Jacob of *ἀσκητικὴ ἀρετή* (virtue attained by practice), see *de Abrahamo*, § 11; *de Josepho*, § 1 (Zeller, iii. 2. 411). The first three are only briefly dwelt on. The greater part of this composition is occupied with Abraham.—In Eusebius, *H. E.* ii. 18. 4, the title runs: *βίου* [read *βίος*] *σοφοῦ τοῦ κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τελειωθέντος ἡ* [περὶ] *νόμων ἀγράφων. Δικαιοσύνην*, instead of the *διδασκαλίαν* furnished by the Philo manuscripts, is here certainly incorrect. For Abraham is the type of *διδασκαλικὴ ἀρετή*. The number α' must be inserted after *ἀγράφων*, this book being only the first of the unwritten laws.

must be placed before that of the *vita Mosis*, which is also probable on other grounds (see note 82 below). At all events there is in the passage no intimation as to what was the actual order of Philo's own works. 2. This is also the case with the second passage, *de praemiis et poenis*, ed. Mang. ii. 408 sq. Philo here divides the revelations (*λόγια*) imparted by means of Moses into three categories (*ιδέαι*), viz. (1) *τὴν περὶ κοσμοποιίας*, (2) *τὸ ἱστορικὸν μέρος*, i.e. the *ἀναγραφὴ πονηρῶν καὶ σπουδαίων βίαν*, and (3) *τὸ νομοθετικὸν μέρος*. Of all this he had, so far as time allowed, treated in his former writings. This indication too can with respect to the *ἱστορικὸν μέρος* refer only to the allegorical commentary. I cannot however discern in it any intimation as to the actual order of Philo's own works, since only the order of the contents of the Pentateuch is given, and it is said, that all this was treated of in Philo's earlier writings.

⁴² J. G. Müller, *Des Juden Philo Buch von der Welterschöpfung*, herausgegeben und erklärt, Berlin 1841.

3. *Βίος πολιτικός ὅπερ ἐστὶ περὶ Ἰωσήφ. De Josepho* (Mangey, ii. 41–79).—After the life of Abraham we next expect the biographies of Isaac and Jacob. That Philo wrote these is made certain by the opening of *de Josepho*. They seem however to have been very soon lost, since not a trace of them is anywhere preserved. The beginning of *de Josepho* makes it also certain, that this composition follows here, which is strange, since we might have expected that the number of typical *βίοι* was exhausted with the triad Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Joseph however is made to succeed them, because the examples of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob refer only to the ideal cosmopolitan state of the world, not to the empiric world with its various constitutions. The life of Joseph is therefore said to show, “how the wise man has to move in actually existing political life.”⁴³—In the editions the title is *βίος πολιτικοῦ*, the manuscripts have *βίος πολιτικός* (Mangey, ii. 41, note. Pitra, *Analecta*, ii. 317). Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 6 : ὁ *πολιτικός*. Photius, *Biblioth. cod.* 103 : *περὶ βίου πολιτικοῦ*. Suidas, *Lex. s.v.* Ἀβραάμ· Φίλων ἐν τῷ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ βίῳ (Suidas in the article Φίλων, following the Greek translator of Jerome, writes *περὶ ἀγωγῆς βίου*).

4. *Περὶ τῶν δέκα λογίων ἃ κεφάλαια νόμων εἰσὶ. De decalogo* (Mangey, ii. 180–209).—After the life of Joseph is generally inserted the life of Moses, which certainly would, according to its literary character, be in place in this group. It is however nowhere intimated that this composition, which comes forward quite independently, is organically connected with the entire work now under discussion. Nay it would be an interruption in it. For in it Moses as a lawgiver stands alone, he is thus no universally valid type of moral conduct, nor is he depicted as such.—Hence the composition *de decalogo* with which the representation of the legislation proper (*τῶν ἀναγραφέντων νόμων, de decal.* § 1) begins, reciting indeed first of all the ten commandments, given by God Himself without the intervention of Moses, must necessarily follow

⁴³ Siegfried, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, 1874, p. 565 sq.

the life of Joseph.—The title of this composition vacillates very much in the manuscripts (Mangey, ii. 180, note). The usual form *περὶ τῶν δέκα λογίων*, resting on the *cod. Augustanus* is confirmed by Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 5. Jerome, in consequence of a careless abbreviation in the text of Eusebius, has *de tabernaculo et decalogo libri quattuor*.

5. *Περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἴδει νόμων εἰς τὰ συντείνοντα κεφάλαια τῶν δέκα λόγων α' β' γ' δ'.* On the special laws referring to the respective heads of the ten sayings. Such is the title according to Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 5 of the work *de specialibus legibus*; and with this agree the Philo-manuscripts with the sole exception, that instead of *εἰς τὰ συντείνοντα κεφάλαια τῶν δέκα λόγων* its special contents are stated for each of the four books (*e.g.* *εἰς τρία γένη τῶν δέκα λόγων, τὸ τρίτον, τὸ τέταρτον, τὸ πέμπτον κ.τ.λ.*). In this work Philo makes a very laudable attempt to reduce the special Mosaic laws to a systematic arrangement, according to the ten rubrics of the decalogue. Thus he states in connection with the first and second commandments (the worship of God) the entire legislation concerning the priesthood and sacrifices, in connection with the fourth (the sanctification of the Sabbath) all the laws concerning festivals, in connection with the seventh (the prohibition of adultery) the marriage laws, in connection with the remaining three the entire civil and criminal law. Herein, notwithstanding the brevity of statement, we frequently recognise an agreement with the Palestinian Halachah. Philo indeed has no professional acquaintance with it, on which account we also meet with many divergences therefrom.⁴⁴ According to the testimony of Eusebius, *H. E.* ii. 18. 5, the whole work comprised *four books*, which have, it seems, been preserved entire, though needing to be restored, from the mangling they have undergone in the manuscripts.

(α) Book I.: *περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἴδει νόμων εἰς β' κεφάλαια τῶν δέκα λογίων τό τε μὴ νομίζειν ἔξω ἐνὸς θεοῦ*

⁴⁴ On Philo's relation to the Halachah, comp. the careful investigation of Bernh. Ritter, *Philo und die Halacha, eine vergleichende Studie*, Leipzig 1879.

ἐτέρους αὐτοκρατεῖς καὶ τὸ μὴ χειρότμητα θεὸν πλαστεῖν. This title, which is missing in the editions, stands in the *cod. Mediceus* at the head of the treatise *de circumcissione* (Mangey, ii. 210, note). But even without this external evidence, the commencement of the said treatise would of itself prove, that this first book begins with it. The whole book comprises the following pieces: *de circumcissione* (Mangey, ii. 210–212), *de monarchia* (Mangey, ii. 213–222),⁴⁵ *de monarchia*, lib. ii. (Mangey, ii. 222–232), *de praemiis sacerdotum* (ii. 232–237), *de victimis* (ii. 237–250),⁴⁶ *de sacrificantibus* or *de victimas offerentibus* (ii. 251–264), *de mercede meretricis non accipienda in sacrarium* (ii. 264–269).⁴⁷

(b) Book II.: *περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἵδει νόμων εἰς τρία γένη τῶν δέκα λόγων, τὸ τρίτον τὴ τέταρτον, τὸ πέμπτον, τὸ περὶ εὐορκίας καὶ σεβασμοῦ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐβδομάδος καὶ γονέων τιμῆς*.⁴⁸ Under this title the editions give first only a small portion (Mangey, ii. 270–277), and then add as a separate portion the treatise *de septenario* (Mangey, ii. 227–298), which of course belongs to this book. The text of *de septenario* is however incomplete in Mangey, and the treatise which we expect, *de colendis parentibus*, is entirely missing. The greater portion of this missing treatise was already given by Mai (*De cophini festo et de colendis parentibus*, Mediolan. 1818, also in *Classicor. auctor.* vol. iv. 402–429); but the complete text of this book was first given by Tischendorf, *Philonea*, pp. 1–83.⁴⁹

(c) Book III.: *περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἵδει νόμων εἰς δύο γένη τῶν δέκα λόγων, τὸ ἕκτον καὶ τὸ ἑβδομον, τὸ κατὰ μοίχων καὶ παντὸς ἀκολάστου καὶ τὸ κατὰ ἀνδροφόνων καὶ πάσης βίας* (Mangey, ii. 299–334).—According to Mangey, ii. 299, note, Philo here shows a knowledge of Roman law.

⁴⁵ The beginning is also in Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xiii. 18. 12 sqq. ed. Gaisford.

⁴⁶ This piece is mentioned Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 5, as a separate composition: *περὶ τῶν εἰς τὰς ἱερουργίας ζώων καὶ τίνα τὰ τῶν θυσιῶν εἶδη*.

⁴⁷ On where this piece belongs, see especially Gfrörer, i. 12 sq.

⁴⁸ The title according to Tischendorf, *Philonea*, p. 1.

⁴⁹ Emendations to the text of Tischendorf were given by Holwerda, 1878. See note 12 above.

(d) Book IV. : *περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἰδει νόμων εἰς τρία γένη τῶν δέκα λογίων, τὸ ἡ' καὶ τὸ θ' καὶ ἰ', τὸ περὶ τοῦ μὴ ἐπικλέπτειν καὶ ψευδομαρτυρεῖν καὶ μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν καὶ τῶν ἐς ἕκαστον ἀναφερομένων καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης, ἥ πᾶσι τοῖς λογίοις ἐφαρμόζει, ὃ ἐστὶ τῆς συντάξεως* (Mangey, ii. 335–358).—This book was first published by Mangey from the *cod. Bodleianus*, 3400. Some kind of word (such as *τέλος*) or the number *δ'* is missing at the close of the title. In the editions the last sections also appear under the special titles : *de iudice* (ii. 344–348) and *de concupiscentia* (ii. 348–358). That they are also integral portions of this book cannot, considering their contents, be doubtful.—To the same book too belongs as an appendix, the treatise *περὶ δικαιοσύνης, de iustitia* (Mangey, ii. 358–374), which again is in the editions wrongly divided into two sections : *de iustitia* (ii. 358–361) and *de creatione principum* (ii. 361–374). The latter section does not deal exclusively with the appointment of authorities, but is simply a continuation of the treatise *de iustitia*. This whole treatise is closely connected with the fourth book *de specialibus legibus*, nay forms part of it, as is intimated by the closing words of the latter (Mang. ii. 358 : *ὡν δὲ περὶ τῆς . . . δικαιοσύνης λεκτέον*) and especially by the title of the whole book, in which it is expressly stated, that it also treats *περὶ δικαιοσύνης, ἥ πᾶσι τοῖς λογίοις ἐφαρμόζει* (Mangey, ii. 335).⁵⁰

6. *Περὶ τριῶν ἀρετῶν ἥτοι περὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ μετανοίας. De fortitudine* (Mangey, ii. 375–383), *de caritate* (ii. 383–405), *de poenitentia* (ii. 405–407).—The treatise *de iustitia*, the continuation of which is here given, is referred to in the commencement of this book (*περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὴν ὅσα καίρια πρότερον εἰπὼν, μέτειμι*

⁵⁰ In Mangey *λογίοις* is printed. I suppose this, a printer's error, is for *λογίαις*. At all events the latter must be the reading. For the thought is, that justice, like the other cardinal virtues, is realized, not by the practice of any one of the commandments, but by the practice of all the ten (it is *τοῖς δέκα λογίοις ἐφαρμόττουσα*, as it is said at the close of *de concupiscentia* (Mang. ii. 358).

τὸ ἐξῆς ἐπ' ἀνδρίαν). This book then also belongs to the appendix of the work *de specialibus legibus*, and it was only an external reason (viz. that of making the two books nearly equal in extent) which occasioned Philo to combine a portion of this appendix with the fourth book itself, and to give the rest as a separate book.⁵¹ The title of this book is found, as given by Mangey in *cod. Bodleianus* (Mang. ii. 375, note). Confirmed by Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 2: *περὶ τῶν τριῶν ἀρετῶν, ἃς σὺν ἄλλαις ἀνέγραψε Μωϋσῆς*. Hieronymus, *vir. illustr.* 11: *de tribus virtutibus liber unus*. Two manuscripts, the *Mediceus* and *Lincolniensis*, have on the other hand: *περὶ ἀρετῶν ἥτοι περὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ εὐσεβείας καὶ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ μετάνοίας*. It seems to speak in favour of this title, that the treatise *de caritate* begins with the words (Mang. ii. 383): *τὴν δὲ εὐσεβείας συγγενεστάτην καὶ ἀδελφὴν καὶ δίδυμον ὄντως ἐξῆς ἐπισκεπτέον, φιλανθρωπίαν*, as though a treatise *de pietate* were missing between *de fortitudine* and *de caritate*. Still the words do not necessarily require this meaning. On the contrary the title of the *Med.* and *Lincoln.* seems to have arisen from this incorrect meaning.⁵²—According to Gfrörer and Dähne only the treatise *de fortitudine* is in place here, and the two others (*de caritate* and *de poenitentia*) must be entirely separated from it and added as an appendix to the

⁵¹ That such external reasons were of authority in the literary activity of the ancients is shown especially by Birt (*Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur*, 1882).—In Philo it is observable almost throughout, that his books occupy about thirty to forty pages in Mangey's edition.

⁵² The predicate *τὴν εὐσεβείας συγγενεστάτην* is said to serve only to characterize the high value of the *φιλανθρωπία* (it is directly related to *εὐσέβεια*, the source of all virtues).—According to the close of *de concupiscentia* (Mang. ii. 358), Philo had already on a former occasion spoken on *εὐσέβεια* and some other cardinal virtues (*περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς ἡγεμονίδος τῶν ἀρετῶν εὐσεβείας καὶ σοφίας, ἔτι δὲ καὶ φρονήσεως καὶ σωφροσύνης εἴρηται πρότερον*). It is probable that this does not mean a separate lost book, but certain sections in the books that have come down to us. See Grossmann, i. pp. 22–24.—We see moreover that the Stoic enumeration of four cardinal virtues, which Philo elsewhere adopts (*Leg. alleg.* i. 56, Mang.: *φρόνησις, σωφροσύνη, ἀνδρεία, δικαιοσύνη*; comp. Zeller, 3rd ed. iii. 2. 403), is here also the basis, though not strictly adhered to.

Vita Mosis.⁵³ The sole foundation however for this view is the bare fact, that in the beginning of *de caritate* the *Vita Mosis* is cited. This is certainly too weak an argument to oppose to the testimony of the manuscripts to the connection of these three treatises with each other. Their contents on the contrary show, that the treatises here placed together, belong to the work *de specialibus legibus*. Those Mosaic laws also are here placed together which belong, not to the rubrics of the ten commandments, but to the rubric of certain cardinal virtues, which latter indeed are only actually realized by the practice of the Decalogue in its entirety (compare the close of *de concupiscentia*, ii. 358, Mangey).⁵⁴

7. *Περὶ ἄθλων καὶ ἐπιτιμίων*. *De praemiis et poenis* (Mangey, ii. 408–428).—*Περὶ ἁρῶν*. *De execrationibus* (Mangey, ii. 429–437).—These two pieces so inaptly separated from each other form in reality but one book. Comp. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 5: *περὶ τῶν προκειμένων ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τοῖς μὲν ἀγαθοῖς ἄθλων, τοῖς δὲ πονηροῖς ἐπιτιμίων καὶ ἁρῶν*.—In the beginning of this composition Philo says, that having in his former works treated of the three main categories of the Mosaic revelations (the *κοσμοποιία*, the *ἱστορικόν* and the *νομοθετικὸν μέρος*), he now purposed to pass to the rewards appointed for the good, and the penalties destined for the wicked. Hence this writing is later than the works of Philo hitherto discussed and joins on as a sort of epilogue to the delineation of the Mosaic legislation.—On the treatise *de nobilitate*, which Mangey combines with this composition, see below, No. IV. 7.

IV. Besides these three large works on the Pentateuch,

⁵³ Gfrörer, i. 17–23. Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1833, pp. 1033–1036. Ersch and Grüber, art. "Philon," p. 443.

⁵⁴ Gfrörer certainly asserts (i. 20) that the treatise *de caritate* "is not written in so didactic and analytic a manner as the compositions *de fortitudine* and *de justitia*, but historically and with constant reference to the life of Moses." In truth however the *de caritate*, being a summary of all such Mosaic laws as fall under the rubric of *φιλανθρωπία* (comp. the survey of its contents in Richter's ed. v. 184), properly belongs to the work *de specialibus legibus*.

Philo wrote several separate compositions, of which the following have been preserved, some entire, some in fragments.

1. *Περὶ βίου Μωσέως*.⁵⁶ *Vita Mosis*, lib. i. (Mangey, ii. 80–133), lib. ii. (Mangey, ii. 134–144), lib. iii. (Mangey, ii. 145–179).—The division into three books is already found in the manuscripts, but is certainly a false one, as is proved by the following quotation by Philo himself, *de caritate*, § 1 (Mangey, ii. 383 sq.): δεδήλωται πρότερον ἐν δυσὶ συντάξεσιν, ἃς ἀνέγραψα περὶ τοῦ βίου Μωϋσέως.⁵⁶ Our books i. and ii. are in fact but one book, as even their extent serves to show. The work is already quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* i. 23. 153: ἡ φησι Φίλων ἐν τῷ Μωυσέως βίῳ. Comp. also *Strom.* ii. 19. 100. Hence it is the more remarkable, that it should be absent from the catalogue of Eusebius. In its place appears (*H. E.* ii. 18. 5) a work *περὶ τῆς σκηνῆς*. Now as the tabernacle is fully described in the *Vita Mosis*, the treatise *περὶ τῆς σκηνῆς* is certainly a portion of the *Vita Mosis*;⁵⁷ probably however the text of Eusebius is imperfect. The date of composition of this work was according to Mangey, ii. 141 (see the passage, note 41 above), probably antecedent to that of the large work on the Mosaic legislation; but probably subsequent to *de mundi opificio* (see below, note 82), and thus, to speak more precisely, between *de mundi opif.* and *de Abrahamo*. We have already seen (p. 342 sq.), that it is no integral element of the delineation of the Mosaic legislation, though certainly connected with it by its entire literary character. *For as in the larger work the Mosaic legislation, so in this the*

⁵⁶ Mangey gives the title in the following form: *Περὶ βίου Μωσέως* (*sic!*) ὅπερ ἐστὶ περὶ θεολογίας καὶ προφητείας. The addition is a very inappropriate one, since the work treats first (Book i.) of Moses as a ruler, and afterwards (Book ii.) of Moses as lawgiver, priest and prophet.

⁵⁶ The reading *τρὶσι* adopted by Mangey and his followers instead of *δυσὶ* is found in only one manuscript, *cod. Paris*, Reg. 2251 (Mangey, ii. 80, note, 383, note). Comp. also Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1833, p. 1031 sq. Ewald, vi. 300.

⁵⁷ So also Grossmann, i. p. 24.

life and acts of the legislator himself are portrayed for heathen readers.

2. *Περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον εἶναι ἐλεύθερον.* *Quod omnis probus liber* (Mangey, ii. 445–470).—This work is properly only one half of a larger one, which worked out the thought suggested in the title in its two opposite aspects, Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 6: *περὶ τοῦ δοῦλον εἶναι πάντα φαῦλον, ὃ ἐξῆς ἐστὶν ὁ περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον ἐλεύθερον εἶναι.* Philo himself alludes to the first and missing half in the opening of the second and preserved half. A long portion of the latter (on the Essenes) is given in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 12. The genuineness of the work has not been unassailed. The circumstance that the description of the Essenes differs in a few subordinate points from that given by Philo himself in another work (*Apologia pro Judaeis* in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11), has especially given rise to suspicion. Its genuineness is however, according to the thorough investigations of Lucius, surpassingly probable. The work may, it is conjectured, belong to Philo's earliest period and may not give the description of the Essenes according to his own inspection.⁵⁸

3. *Εἰς Φλάκκον.* *Adversus Flaccum* (Mangey, ii. 517–544).—*Περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ πρεσβείας πρὸς Γάϊον.* *De legatione ad Cajum* (Mangey, ii. 545–600).—In these two books Philo relates the persecutions which the Jews had to endure, especially at Alexandria, in the time of Caligula. The narrative is so detailed and graphic, that it could be written only by one who had himself participated in a prominent manner in the events. This circumstance makes these two books an authority of the first rank, not only for the history of the Jews of those days, but also for the history of Caligula. It cannot be perceived from the statements in Mangey, how the

⁵⁸ Lucius, *Der Essenismus* (1881), pp. 13–23. Hilgenfeld also esteems this work genuine, but on the contrary regards the *Apologia pro Judaeis* as spurious (*Zeitschrift für wissensch. Theol.* 1882, pp. 275–278. *Ketzer-geschichte des Urchristenthums*, 1884, pp. 87 sq., 105–116).

titles run in the best manuscripts. On the title *Φίλωνος εἰς Φλάκκον* he only remarks (ii. 517): similiter codex Mediceus, in reliquis vero manuscriptis scribitur *Φίλωνος Ἐβραίου ἱστορία ὠφέλιμος καὶ πάνν βίῳ χρήσιμος. Τὰ κατὰ τὸν Φλάκκον* [*sic*: therefore not *τοῦ Φλάκκου*] ἤτοι περὶ προνοίας.^{58a} Still more indefinite are Mangey's statements concerning the title of the second composition (ii. 545): in nonnullis codicibus sic legitur: *ἱστορία χρήσιμος καὶ πάνν ὠφέλιμος περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν Γάϊον καὶ τῆς αἰτίας τῆς πρὸς ἅπαν τὸ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος ἀπεχθείας αὐτοῦ*. According to the statements of Pitra (*Analecta sacra*, ii. 318 sq.) the titles usual in the printed text *Εἰς Φλάκκον* and *Περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ πρεσβείας πρὸς Γάϊον* appear to be also those which prevail in the manuscripts. In Photius, *Bibliotheca cod.* 105 (ed. Bekker), it is said: *Ἀνεγνώσθη δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ λόγος οὗ ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ "Γάϊος ψεγόμενος" καὶ "Φλάκκος ἢ Φλάκκων ψεγόμενος," ἐν οἷς λόγοις κ.τ.λ.* (therefore two *λόγοι*). So too Eusebius in the *Chronicle*.⁵⁹ Comp. also Johannes Monachus ineditus (Mangey, ii. 517): *ἐκ τῶν κατὰ Φλάκκον*. On the titles mentioned by Eusebius in the *Ecclesiastical History* see farther on. Only the two books which have come down to us seem to have been extant in the time of Photius. But the beginning of the first and the close of the second show, that they are only portions of a larger whole. For the book *adversus Flaccum* begins (ii. 517): *Δεύτερος μετὰ Σηιανὸν Φλάκκος Ἀουίλλιος διαδέχεται τὴν κατὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐπιβουλὴν*. Thus this book was preceded by another, in which the persecutions inflicted on the Jews by Sejanus were narrated. The book *de legatione*

^{58a} The title *κατὰ Φλάκκον* also in the *codex Coislinianus* is in Pitra *Analecta sacra*, ii. 310.

⁵⁹ Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene, ii. 150–151. The text runs: (a) according to Jerome (*l.c.* p. 151, note k): Refert Filo in eo libro qui Flaccus inscribitur; (b) according to the Armenian (p. 150, note q): Philon in eo libro, quem ipse ad Flacum scripsit, refert; (c) according to Syncellus (ed. Dindorf, i. 626): *Φίλων ἱστορεῖ ἐν τῷ ἐπιγεγραμμένῳ λόγῳ Φλάκκῳ* (the title *ad Flacum* in the Armenian translation arose from a mistaken understanding of this dative *Φλάκκῳ*. Thus a comparison of Jerome and the Armenian shows, that the correct text of Eusebius is preserved in Syncellus).

ad Cajum moreover ends with the words: *Εἴρηται μὲν οὖν κεφαλαιωδέστερον ἢ αἰτία τῆς πρὸς ἅπαν τὸ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος ἀπεχθείας Γαΐον λεκτέον δὲ καὶ τὴν παλινῳδίαν [πρὸς Γαΐον].*⁶⁰ Hence another book must have followed, in which Philo related the *παλινῳδία*, i.e. the turn for the better in the fate of the Jews by the death of Caligula and the edict of toleration of Claudius. Now we know also from a notice in the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, that the persecutions under Sejanus were related in the *second book* of this entire work.⁶¹ Consequently we should reckon not less than *five books* for the whole. And this is confirmed by the decided statement in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius, ii. 5. 1: *καὶ δὴ τὰ κατὰ Γαΐον οὗτος Ἰουδαίους συμβάντα πέντε βιβλίοις παραδίδωσι.* The brief survey too, given by Eusebius of the contents of this work, agrees exactly with these results. For he says, that Philo here relates, how in the time of Tiberius Sejanus made great exertions in Rome to destroy the whole nation, and that in Judaea Pilate caused great commotion among the Jews, because he desired to undertake something with respect to the temple, which was contrary to their institutions.⁶² After the death however of Tiberius, Caius, who then came to the throne, behaved indeed with the greatest arrogance to all, but inflicted most injury on the

⁶⁰ The words *πρὸς Γαΐον* are according to Mangey missing in the manuscripts, and must therefore certainly be expunged.

⁶¹ Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene, ii. 150–151, and indeed: (a) according to Jerome (*l.c.* p. 151, note b): Sejanus praefectus Tiberii, qui apud eum plurimum poterat, instantissime cohortatur, ut gentem Judaeorum deleat. Filo meminit in libro legationis secundo. (b) According to the Armenian (p. 150): Sejanus Tiberii procurator, qui intimus erat consiliarius regis, universim gentem Judaeorum deperendam exposcebat. Meminit autem hujus Philon in secunda relatione. (c) According to Syncellus (ed. Dindorf, i. 621): Σηιανὸς ἑπαρχὸς Τιβερίου Καίσαρος περὶ τελείας ἀπωλείας τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων πολλὰ συνεβούλευε τῷ Καίσαρι, ὡς Φίλων Ἰουδαίος ἐξ Ἀλεξανδρείας διάγων ἱστορεῖ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῆς περὶ αὐτοῦ πρεσβείας.

⁶² *H. E.* ii. 5. 7: Πρῶτον δὲ οὖν κατὰ Τιβέριον ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς Ῥωμαίων πόλεως ἱστορεῖ Σηιανόν . . . ἄρδην τὸ πᾶν ἔθνος ἀπολίσθαι σπουδὴν εἰσηγηχέναι, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς Ἰουδαίας Πιλᾶτον . . . περὶ τὸ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἔτι τότε συνεστῶς ἱερὸν ἐπιχειρήσαντά τι παρὰ τὸ Ἰουδαίους ἐξὸν τὰ μέγιστα αὐτοῦς ἀναταράξαι.

whole Jewish nation.⁶³ What is here said respecting Sejanus and Pilate cannot refer to some occasional declarations in the books preserved to us. For these treat only of the time of Caligula. The oppressions however of Sejanus and Pilate must, according to the above intimations of Eusebius, have been related in a separate paragraph, before the events under Caligula. From all that has been said the following must consequently have been the *arrangement of the whole work*. Book i. contained, it may be presumed, a general introduction. Book ii. related the oppressions in the reign of Tiberius, by Sejanus in Rome and by Pilate in Judaea. Among the former must undoubtedly be placed the important measure of A.D. 19, by which all Jews were banished from Rome.⁶⁴ Among the attempts of Pilate "to undertake something with respect to the temple contrary to Jewish institutions," the setting up of consecrated shields in the palace of Herod, mentioned in the letter of Agrippa,⁶⁵ communicated by Philo, cannot at all events be intended; we must rather regard them as the facts recorded by Josephus, viz. that Pilate caused the soldiers to march into Jerusalem with the imperial ensigns and employed the temple-treasure in building an aqueduct.⁶⁶ That the former act was also related by Philo is expressly testified by Eusebius.⁶⁷ Book iii. is the preserved composition *adversus Flaccum*, which relates the persecution of the Alexandrian

⁶³ H. E. ii. 6. 1: Μετὰ δὲ τὴν Τιβερίου τελευτὴν Γάϊον τὴν ἀρχὴν παρελθόντα . . . πάντων μάλιστα τὸ πᾶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος οὐ σμικρὰ καταβλάψαι.

⁶⁴ Tacitus, *Annal.* ii. 85. Sueton. *Tiber.* 36. Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 3. 5. Comp. also Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 24 (Mang. ii. 569).

⁶⁵ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 38 (Mang. ii. 589 sq.).

⁶⁶ Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 3. 1-2. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 2-4. Comp. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 6.

⁶⁷ Euseb. *Demonstratio evangelica*, viii. p. 403: Αὐτὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ ὁ Φίλων συμμαρτυρεῖ, τὰς σημαίας φάσκων τὰς βασιλικὰς τὸν Πιλάτον νύκτωρ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀναθεῖναι. A confusion with Josephus cannot exist, since Eusebius just before in the same passage quotes Josephus also as authority for the same fact.—It must also be remembered, that the setting up of the statue took place according to Philo in the temple, i.e. the temple forecourt (which indeed Eusebius erroneously gives as also the account of Josephus).

Jews arising from the initiative of the populace of that city in the commencement of Caligula's reign. It had as yet nothing to do with the setting up of the statue of the emperor in the Jewish synagogue, nor with any edict of Caligula. In Book iv., on the contrary, *i.e.* in the *Legatio ad Cajum*, which is preserved, are depicted the sufferings inflicted on the Jews in consequence of the edict of Caligula, that Divine honours should everywhere be paid him. Lastly, the lost Book v. treated of the *παλινοδία* in the sense stated above.

The statements of Eusebius give rise also to some difficulties with regard to the *title of the entire work*. According to the passage from the *Chronicle* quoted above (note 61), the whole work seems to have been designated *ἡ πρεσβεία*. And Eusebius says also, when giving the contents of the whole work, that all this is written *ἐν ᾗ συνέγραψε πρεσβεία* (*H. E.* ii. 5. 6). This title is therefore possible, because Philo's account of the embassy to Caligula, of which he was the leader, forms in fact the kernel of the whole. The several books might then have had their special titles, such as *Φλάκκος* or the like (see above, p. 350). Now Eusebius says further, towards the conclusion of his summary of the contents, that Philo had related a thousand other sufferings, which befell the Jews at Alexandria *ἐν δευτέρῳ συγγράμματι ᾧ ἐπέγραψε "περὶ ἀρετῶν"* (*H. E.* ii. 6. 3). From this it appears to result, that Philo had treated of these events in two works, the title of one being *ἡ πρεσβεία*, of the other *περὶ ἀρετῶν*. This inference is however precluded not only by its improbability, but by the circumstance, that Eusebius in his chief catalogue of Philo's writings, *H. E.* ii. 18, only mentions the latter title. He says, that Philo ironically gave to his work on the ungodly deeds of Caius the title *περὶ ἀρετῶν* (*H. E.* ii. 18. 8). No other work referring to these events is mentioned, though the catalogue is in other respects a very complete one. We are thus, I think, constrained to admit, that the *δευτέρῳ* is the gloss of a transcriber, who could not make the different titles in ii. 5. 6 and ii. 6. 3 harmonize,

and that in fact both titles refer to one and the same work.

A special interest has always been attached to this work by reason of its importance as an historical authority. It has been repeatedly published separately,⁶⁸ translated into modern languages⁶⁹ and made the subject of historical research.⁷⁰ The dispute of its genuineness by Grätz scarcely deserves mention.⁷¹ This book must not be confounded with the book *de tribus virtutibus* (see above, p. 345), nor with that published by Mai, *de virtute ejusque partibus* (see above, note 10).

4. *Περὶ προνοίας. De providentia.*—The title in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 6; *Praep. evang.* vii. 20 *fin.*, viii. 13 *fin.* The work is only preserved in Armenian, and has been published by Aucher with a Latin translation.⁷² Two Greek fragments, a smaller and a very large one in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* vii. 21

⁶⁸ *Philonis Judaei lib. de virtutibus s. de legatione ad Cajum imp. graece cura*, S. F. N. Mori, Lips. 1781. Dahl, *Chrestomathia Philoniana*, 2 vols. 1800–1802. On a Paris edition of 1626 comp. Fabricius-Harles, iv. 741 Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 89.

⁶⁹ *Die Gesandtschaft an den Cajus, aus dem Griechischen des Philo*, translated by Jo. Frid. Eckhard, Leipzig 1783. *Philo Judaeus, om Judarnas förföljelse under Flaccus och Legationen till Cajus Caligula, etc., öfversätn. med noter och anmerkn.*, by J. Berggren, Söderköping 1853. *Philon d'Alexandrie, écrits historiques, influence, luttes et persécutions des juifs dans le monde romain*, by F. Delaunay, 2nd ed. Paris 1870 (gives a translation of *contra Flaccum* and *Leg. ad Caj.*). On an older French translation of d'Andilly, see Fabric.-Harles, iv. 749. On an English one, Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii. 91. An English translation by Yonge of Philo's entire works appeared in 4 vols. London 1854–55.

⁷⁰ Comp. above, § 17^e, and the literature there mentioned. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* iv. 740 sq., and the works and articles there mentioned of Boecler, Tillemont, Ernesti and especially Jo. Christ. Gottleber, *Animadversiones historicae et philologico-criticae ad Philonis legationem ad Cajum*, 4 pts. Meissen 1773–74. Dähne in Ersch and Gruber, art. "Philon," pp. 439–440. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus* (1879), pp. 117–123.

⁷¹ Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 2nd ed. iii. 487–492, abridged in the 3rd ed. iii. 681. Comp. also *Monaatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1877, pp. 97 sqq., 145 sqq.

⁷² Aucher, *Philonis Judaei sermones tres*, etc. (1822) pp. 1–121. Also in Latin in Richter's hand edition (8th small vol.), and in the Tauchnitz edition (8th small vol.).

and viii. 14. The Armenian text comprises *two books*. Of these however, the first, though on the whole genuine, has at all events been preserved in only an abbreviated and in some parts a touched up form.⁷³ Eusebius seems to have been acquainted with only the second, at least both fragments belong to this book, and are introduced by Eusebius with the formula ἐν τῷ (*Sing.*) περὶ προνοίας.⁷⁴ In the *Ecclesiastical History* the reading fluctuates between τὸ περὶ προνοίας and τὰ περὶ προνοίας. There are quotations also in Johannes Damascenus and Johannes Monachus ineditus.⁷⁵

5. Ἀλέξανδρος ἡ περὶ τοῦ λόγου ἔχειν τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα (this title in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 6). *De Alexandro et quod propriam rationem muta animalia habeant* (so Jerome, *de viris illustr.* c. 11).⁷⁶—This work too is preserved only in Armenian, and has been published by Aucher.⁷⁷ Two short Greek fragments are found in the Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes.⁷⁸ The book belongs to Philo's later works, the embassy to Rome being already contemplated, p. 152 (ed. Aucher).

6. Ὑποθετικά.—Our knowledge of this work rests solely on the fragments in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 6–7, which are introduced by Eusebius with the words (viii. 5, *fin.*): Φίλωνος

⁷³ Comp. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci* (1879), pp. 1–4. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881), p. 340.

⁷⁴ The first fragment (vii. 21) is from the middle of the second book (Aucher, pp. 80–82); the second (viii. 14) consists of several large portions extending throughout the second book, and forming a selection from it (Aucher, pp. 44–121). The two small fragments, published by Höschel (1614), and taken by him from the *Ἰωνιά* of Michael apostolius (see Fabricius-Harles, v. 110 sq., ix. 758, xi. 189 sqq. Nicolai, *Griech. Litgesch.* iii. 316 sqq.), are perhaps also derived from Eusebius. See the fragments in the Frankfort ed. p. 1197 sq.; and Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ed. Gaisford, viii. 14. 2–7 and 39–41.

⁷⁵ See Mangey, ii. 634, note x.

⁷⁶ Some editions and manuscripts of Jerome have *De Alexandro dicente quod*, etc.

⁷⁷ Aucher, *Philonis Judaei sermones tres*, etc. (1822) pp. 123–172. And following him Richter (8th small vol.) and the Tauchnitz edition (8th small vol.).

⁷⁸ Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1, p. 99^b (below): ἐκ τοῦ περὶ τῶν ἀλόγων ζῴων. *Ibid.* p. 100^a (above): ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ.

. . . ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου συγγράμματος ὃν ἐπέγραψεν Ὑποθετικῶν, ἔνθα τὸν ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων ὡς πρὸς κατηγοροὺς αὐτῶν ποιούμενος λόγον ταῦτά φησιν. The title does not signify "suppositions concerning the Jews,"⁷⁹ but, as Bernays has pointed out, "counsels, recommendations." For Ὑποθετικοὶ λόγοι are such dissertations as contain moral counsels or recommendations, in contradistinction to theoretical investigations of ethic questions. Philo, as the preserved fragments already show, has devoted the main point of his work to the discussion of such Jewish precepts as he could *recommend* to the obedience of a non-Jewish circle of readers, to whom the work is unmistakeably directed.⁸⁰ As the work pursues apologetic aims, we might be inclined to regard it as identical with the *Apologia pro Judæis* to be forthwith mentioned, but that Eusebius distinguishes the two by different titles.

7. Περὶ Ἰουδαίων.—This title in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 6. Ἡ ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων ἀπολογία, from which Eusebius (*Præp. evang.* viii. 11) borrows the description of the Essenes, is certainly identical with this work. The conjecture of Dähne, that the piece *de nobilitate* (Mangey, ii. 437–444) also belongs to this work is not improbable.⁸¹ It treats of true nobility *i.e.* of the wisdom and virtue, of which the Jewish nation also was not devoid, and is therefore a very suitable element in an apology for the Jews. The genuineness of the ἀπολογία has been recently disputed by Hilgenfeld (see above, note 58).

V. The last-named works are only known to us by fragments, but the following books, most of which have been already mentioned in this survey, are *entirely lost*. (1) Of the *Quæstiones et solutiones*, two books on Genesis and more

⁷⁹ So Ewald, vi. 304. Comp. also Grossmann, i. p. 16.

⁸⁰ Bernays, "Philon's Hypoethika und die Verwünschungen des Buzyges in Athen" (*Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1876, pp. 589–609; reprinted in Bernays, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1885, i. 262–282. Comp. especially p. 599).

⁸¹ Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1833, pp. 990, 1037. In the article "Philon" in Ersch and Grüber, p. 440, Dähne again expresses this conjecture.

than three on Exodus (see above, p. 327). (2) Two books of the *Legum allegorice* (see above, p. 332). (3) The first book *περὶ μέθης* (see p. 335). (4) Both the books *περὶ διαθηκῶν* (see p. 337). (5) Three of the five books *de somniis* (see p. 337). (6) The two biographies of Isaac and Jacob (see p. 342). (7) The work *περὶ τοῦ δοῦλον εἶναι πάντα φαῦλον* (see p. 349). (8) The first, second and fifth books of the work on the persecutions of the Jews under Caligula (see p. 350). (9) A work *περὶ ἀριθμῶν*, to which Philo refers in the *Vita Mosis* and elsewhere.⁸² (10) A dialogue between Isaac and Ishmael on the difference between true wisdom and sophism, of which it is not indeed certain, whether Philo wrote or only intended to write it.⁸³ (11) According to a remark in *Quod omnis probus liber*, Philo intended to write a disquisition "On the government of the wise."⁸⁴ We do not know whether this intention was carried out. (12) In the *Florilegium* of Leontius and Johannes a small piece is cited *ἐκ τῶν περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ*.⁸⁵ Can a work known to us under some other name be intended?

VI. The following supposed works of Philo are now pretty generally regarded as spurious:—

1. *Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ ἢ ἱκετῶν ἀρετῶν*. *De vita contemplativa* (Mangey, ii. 471–486).—Eusebius twice cites the

⁸² *Vita Mosis*, lib. iii. § 11 (Mang. ii. 152): ἔχει ■ καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀμνηστῆτους ἀρετὰς ἢ τετραὶς, ὧν τὰς πλείους ἠκριβώσαμεν ἐν τῇ περὶ ἀριθμῶν πραγματείᾳ.—*Quaest. et solut. in Genes.* ed. Aucher, p. 331: jam dictum fuit in libro, in quo de numeris actum est. Comp. the same, pp. 224, 359. Grossmann, i. p. 24. In the work *de officio mundi* Philo refers to a dissertation on the number four as one yet to be written, p. 11, Mang.: πολλὰς δὲ καὶ ἄλλας κέχρηται δυνάμει ἢ τετραὶς ἃς ἀκριβέστερον καὶ ἐν τῇ περὶ αὐτῆς ἰδίῳ λόγῳ προσυποδεικνύειν. If this is identical with the work *περὶ ἀριθμῶν*, it would follow, that the *Vita Mosis* was a later work than *de officio mundi*. Comp. Grossmann, ii. p. 6.

⁸³ *De sobrietate*, § 2 (Mang. i. 394 above): Σοφίαν μὲν γὰρ Ἰσαάκ, σοφιστείαν ■ Ἰσμαὴλ κεκλήρωται, ὥς, ἐπειδὴν ἐκάτερον χαρακτηρίζωμεν, ἐν τισὶ διαλόγοις ἐπιδείκνυμεν. Comp. Grossmann, i. p. 25.

⁸⁴ *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 3 (Mang. ii. 448): 'Ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ σοφοῦ λόγος εἰς καιρὸν ἐπιτηδεϊότερον ὑπερκίσθω. Comp. Grossmann, i. p. 25.

⁸⁵ Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1, p. 103a.

title in the following form (*H. E.* ii. 17. 3 and ii. 18. 7): *περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ ἢ ἱκετῶν*. The *ἀρετῶν* added at the end must therefore be expunged. Eusebius, *H. E.* ii. 17, gives full information concerning the contents, comp. also ii. 16. 2. This composition has, since the time of Eusebius, enjoyed special approbation in the Christian Church, Christian monks being almost universally recognised in the "Therapeutae" here described and glorified.⁸⁶ The likeness is indeed surprising; but for that very reason the suspicion is also well founded, that the author's design, was under the mask of Philo to recommend Christian monachism. But apart from this there are other suspicious elements, by reason of which even such critics as do not regard the Therapeutae as representing a Christian, but as a Jewish ideal of life, have denied the authorship of Philo.⁸⁷ Upon the ground of the identification of the Therapeutae with Christian monks, Lucius, after the precedent of Grätz and Jost,⁸⁸ has declared this composition spurious.⁸⁹ It is by his thorough and methodical investigation that the spuriousness of its authorship has been definitely decided.⁹⁰

⁸⁶ Photius, *Bibliotheca cod.* 104 forms an exception: *Ανεγνώσθησαν δὲ καὶ τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις φιλοσοφούντων τὴν τε θεωρητικὴν καὶ τὴν πρακτικὴν φιλοσοφίαν βίος ὧν μὲν Ἑσσηνοὶ οἱ δὲ θεραπευταὶ ἐκαλοῦντο κ.τ.λ.* Epiphanius, *Haer.* 29. 5, quotes this composition with the formula *ἐν τῇ περὶ Ἰησοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπιγραφομένη βίβλῳ*, but is nevertheless of opinion that it treats of Christians. Compare the *testimonia veterum* before Mangey's edition and the literature in Fabricius-Harles, iv. 738 sq. Of this older literature must be specially mentioned Montfaucon's French translation, furnished with valuable notes, *Le livre de Philon de la vie contemplative etc., traduit sur l'original grec, avec des observations, ou l'on fait voir, que les Therapeutes, dont il parle, étoient Chrétiens*, Paris 1709. The texts of an old and of a more recent Latin version are given by Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, ii. 322-331.

⁸⁷ Especially Nicolas, *Revue de Théologie*, Strasbourg 1868, p. 25 sqq., and Kuenen, *De godsdienst van Israël*, ii. 440-444. Also Weingarten, art. "Mönchtum," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. 761-764.

⁸⁸ Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 2nd ed. iii. 463 sqq. Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, i. 214, note 2.

⁸⁹ Lucius, *Die Therapeuten und ihre Stellung in der Geschichte der Askese, eine kritische Untersuchung der Schrift de vita contemplativa*, Strassburg 1879.

⁹⁰ Comp. also my notice of Lucius in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1880,

2. *Περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου. De incorruptibilitate mundi* (Mangey, ii. 487–516).—This composition is regarded as genuine by Grossmann and Dähne.⁹¹ But even the transmission of the manuscripts and the external testimony are unfavourable to its genuineness,⁹² which since the investigations of Bernays has been generally given up. Bernays has also especially shown, that the traditional text has fallen into disorder through the transposition of the pages.⁹³ He has published the text in Greek and German according to the order restored by himself,⁹⁴ and furnished it with a commentary.⁹⁵ Bücheler gives emendations of Bernays' text.⁹⁶ Zeller attempts to show that the composition has been touched up.⁹⁷

3. *Περὶ κόσμου. De mundo* (Mangey, ii. 601–624).—The spuriousness of this work has long been acknowledged.⁹⁸ It

pp. 111–118. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1880, pp. 423–440. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881), p. 307. For its genuineness also Delaunay, *Revue archéologique*, new series, vol. xxii. (1870–71) pp. 268–282, xxvi. (1873) pp. 12–22. The same, *Moines et sibylles dans l'antiquité judéo-grecque* 1874, pp. 11–51. Bestmann, *Gesch. der christlichen Sitte*, vol. i. (1880) p. 133 sqq.

⁹¹ Grossmann, i. p. 21. Dähne in Ersch and Gruber, art. "Philon," p. 441.

⁹² Mangey remarks of this composition (ii. 487, note): deest in maxima parte codicum, nec recensetur in indiculis Eusebii Hieronymi Photii et Suidae.

⁹³ Bernays, "Ueber die Herstellung des Zusammenhanges in der unter Philo's Namen gehenden Schrift *περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου* durch Blätterversetzung" (*Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1863, pp. 34–40; reprinted in Bernays, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1885, i. 283–290).

⁹⁴ Bernays, "Die unter Philon's Werken stehende Schrift über die Unzerstörbarkeit des Weltalls nach ihrer ursprünglichen Anordnung wiederhergestellt und ins Deutsche übertragen" (*Transactions of the Berlin Academy*, 1876, *phil.-hist. class*, pp. 209–278). Also separately.

⁹⁵ Bernays, "Ueber die unter Philon's Werken stehende Schrift über die Unzerstörbarkeit des Weltalls" (*Transactions of the Berlin Academy*, 1882, *phil.-hist. class*, Tr. iii. p. 82). Also separately. The commentary has been published by Usener as a posthumous work of Bernays.

⁹⁶ Bücheler, *Philonea (Rhein. Museum*, vol. xxxii. 1877, pp. 433–444).

⁹⁷ Zeller, *Der pseudophilonische Bericht über Theophrast* (*Hermes*, vol. xv. 1880, pp. 137–146).

⁹⁸ Wilh. Budäus, who translated it into Latin (1526), already acknowledged

is a collection of extracts from other works of Philo, especially from the composition *de incorruptibilitate mundi*.⁹⁹

4. *De Sampson* (Aucher, *Paralipomena Armena*, 1826, pp. 549–577).—*De Jona* (Aucher, pp. 578–611).—A general agreement prevails as to the spuriousness of these two discourses, which are published in Armenian and Latin by Aucher.¹⁰⁰

5. *Interpretatio Hebraicorum nominum*. Origen, *Comment. in Joann.* vol. ii. c. 27 (*Opp.* ed. Lommatzsch, i. 150), mentions an apparently anonymous work on this subject: *εὐρομεν τοῖνυν ἐν τῇ ἐρμηνείᾳ τῶν ὀνομάτων*. Eusebius says, that it is ascribed to Philo, but the manner in which he speaks of it plainly shows, that he was only acquainted with the work as an anonymous one, *H. E.* ii. 18. 7: *καὶ τῶν ἐν νόμῳ δὲ καὶ προφήταις Ἑβραϊκῶν ὀνομάτων αἱ ἐρμηνεῖαι τοῦ αὐτοῦ σπουδαῖ εἶναι λέγονται*. Jerome says, that according to the testimony of Origen, Philo was the author. Hence he evidently saw the work only in an anonymous copy. He himself desired to translate it into Latin, but found the text so barbarized, that he considered it necessary to undertake an entirely new work.¹⁰¹ In the preface he expresses himself concerning the history of these Onomastica as follows: Philo, *vir disertissimus Judaeorum*, Origenis quoque testimonio conprobatur edidisse *librum hebraicorum nominum eorumque etymologias juxta ordinem litterarum e latere copulasse*. Qui cum vulgo habeatur a Graecis et bibliothecas orbis inpleverit, studii mihi fuit in latinam eum linguam vertere. Verum tam

its spuriousness. Comp. also Mangey, ii. 601, note. Fabricius-Harles, iv. 742. Grossmann, i. p. 21. Dähne in Ersch and Grüber, art. "Philon."

⁹⁹ See the parallels pointed out in Grossmann, i. p. 28.

¹⁰⁰ The text is also given in Richter's and the Tauchnitz editions. Comp. generally: Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1833, pp. 987–989. Freudenthal, *Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift über die Herrschaft der Vernunft* (Fourth Book of Maccabees), 1869, pp. 9–12, 141–147. Grossmann, i. p. 21, does not express himself quite decidedly on the question of genuineness.

¹⁰¹ This Onomasticon of Jerome (*liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum*) is in Vallarsi's edition of Jerome's works, vol. iii. 1–120, and in Lagarde, *Onomastica sacra* (1870), pp. 1–81.

dissona inter se exemplaria repperi et sic confusum ordinem, ut tacere melius judicaverim quam reprehensione quid dignum scribere. Itaque . . . singula per ordinem scripturarum volumina percucurri et vetus aedificium nova cura instaurans fecisse me reor quod a Graecis quoque adpetendum sit. . . . Ac ne forte consummato aedificio quasi extrema deesset manus, novi testamenti verba et nomina interpretatus sum, imitari volens ex parte Origenem, quem post apostolos ecclesiarum magistrum nemo nisi inperitus negat. Inter cetera enim ingeni sui praeclara monumenta etiam in hoc laboravit, ut quod Philo quasi Judaeus omiserat hic ut christianus inpleret. According to this account of Jerome *it must certainly be admitted, that Origen already considered Philo to be the author.* But the work being anonymous his testimony is not sufficient, and the question of authorship cannot be decided on internal grounds, because the work is no longer extant in its most ancient form.¹⁰² A tolerably copious list of Philonean etymologies may be collected from those works of Philo which have been preserved.¹⁰³

6. On a Latin work *de biblicis antiquitatibus*, ascribed to Philo, see Fabricius-Harles, iv. 743, and especially Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, ii. 298 sq., 319–322. The pseudo-Philonian *Breviarum temporum*, a forgery of Anniius of Viterbo (Fabricius-Harles, *l.c.*), must not be confounded with this. On the treatise *de virtute ejusque partibus*, published by Mai under Philo's name, see above, note 10.

¹⁰² For various Greek and Latin Onomastica of scriptural names, see Vallarsi, *Hieronymi Opp.* iii. 537 sqq., and Lagarde, *Onomastica sacra*, p. 161 sqq. The work *de nominibus Hebraicis* (see above, note 21), printed under Philo's name in the Basle collection of certain works of Philo, is simply the Onomasticon of Jerome. Comp. on this whole literature, Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca graeca*, iv. 742 sq., vi. 199 sqq., vii. 226 sq.

¹⁰³ Such collections are found in Vallarsi, *Hieronymi Opp.* iii. 731–744, and in Siegfried, *Philonische Studien* (Merx' Archiv, ii. 2. 143–163).

II. THE DOCTRINE OF PHILO.

*The Literature.*¹⁰⁴

- Stahl, "Versuch eines systematischen Entwurfs des Lehrbegriffs Philo's von Alexandrien" (Eichhorn's *Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Litteratur*, vol. iv. paragraph 5, 1793, pp. 765-890).
- Grossmann, *Questiones Philoneae*. I. *De theologiae Philonis fontibus et auctoritate quaestionis primae particula prima*. II. *De λόγῳ Philonis. Quaestio altera*. Lips. 1829.
- Gfrörer, *Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie* (also under the title *Kritische Geschichte des Urchristenthums*), 2 vols. Stuttgart 1831.
- Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie*, 2 vols. Halle 1834. Comp. also his art. "Philon" in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyklopädie*.
- Bitter, *Geschichte der Philosophi*, vol. iv. (1834), pp. 418-492.
- Georgii, "Ueber die neuesten Gegensätze in Auffassung der Alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie, insbesondere des Jüdischen Alexandrinismus" (*Zeitschr. für die histor. Theol.* 1839, No. 3, pp. 3-98, No. 4, pp. 3-98).
- Lücke, *Commentar über das Evang. des Johannes*, vol. i. (3rd ed. 1840) p. 272 sqq.
- Keferstein, *Philo's Lehre von den göttlichen Mittelwesen, zugleich eine kurze Darstellung der Grundzüge des philonischen Systems*, Leipzig 1846.
- Bucher, *Philonische Studien*, Tübingen 1848.
- Niedner, *De subsistentia τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ apud Philonem tributa quaestionis*, Parts i. ii. Lips. 1848, 1849 (also in the *Zeitsch. für die histor. Theol.* 1849).
- Lutterbeck, *Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, vol. i. (1852) pp. 418-446.
- Dorner, *Entwicklungsgesch. der Lehre von der Person Christi*, vol. i. pp. 21-57.
- Wolff, *Die philonische Philosophie in ihren Hauptmomenten dargestellt*, 2nd ed. 1858.
- Joel, "Ueber einige geschichtliche Beziehungen des philonischen Systems" (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1863, pp. 19-31).

¹⁰⁴ For the older literature see Fabricius-Harles, iv. 721-727. Comp. also Freudenthal, "Zur Geschichte der Anschauungen über die jüdisch-hellenistische Religionsphilosophie" (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1869, pp. 399-421).

Frankel, "Zur Ethik des jüdisch-alexandrinischen Philosophen Philo" (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1867, pp. 241-252, 281-297).

Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, i. 208-225.

Lipsius, art. "Alexandrinische Religionsphilosophie," in Schenkel's *Bibell.* i. 85-99.

Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Part iii. Div. 2 (3rd ed. 1881), pp. 338-418.

Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen Philosophie* (1872), pp. 204-297.

Stein, *Sieben Bücher zur Geschichte des Platonismus*, Part iii. (1875) pp. 3-17.

Soulrier, *La doctrine du Logos chez Philon d'Alexandrie*, Turin 1876 (comp. *Theol. Litztg.* 1877, 101).

Révillé, *Le Logos d'après Philon d'Alexandrie*, Genève 1877 (see Bursian's *Philol. Jahresber.* xxi. 35 sq.). The same, *La doctrine du Logos dans le quatrième évangile et dans les oeuvres de Philon*, Paris 1881.

Nicolas, "Etudes sur Philon d'Alexandrie" (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, vol. v. 1882, pp. 318-339; vol. vii. 1883, pp. 145-164; vol. viii. 1883, pp. 468-488, 582-602, 756-772).

Comp. also the works and articles mentioned above, p. 321 sq., of Steinhart, J. G. Müller, Ewald, Ueberweg, Hausrath, Siegfried, Hamburger, Zöckler.

The survey already given of Philo's works is sufficient to show the many-sidedness of his culture and of his literary efforts. That which applies to the representatives of Judaeo-Hellenism in general, viz. that they combined in themselves both *Jewish and Hellenic* culture, is pre-eminently true of him. It must be admitted, that *Greek philosophy* comes the most prominently into the foreground.¹⁰⁵ He was a man saturated with every means of culture afforded in his age by the schools of the Greeks. His diction was formed by the Greek classical authors; and especially "may the influence of Plato's works upon Philo in even a lexical and phraseological respect be called very considerable."¹⁰⁶ He was intimately acquainted with the great Greek poets Homer,

¹⁰⁵ Comp. on this and especially on Philo's linguistic culture, Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria*, pp. 31-141. Also Zeller, iii. 2. 343 sqq.

¹⁰⁶ Siegfried, *Philo*, p. 32.

Euripides and others, whom he occasionally quotes.¹⁰⁷ But it is the philosophers whom he most highly esteems. He calls Plato "the great;"¹⁰⁸ Parmenides, Empedocles, Zeno, Cleanthes are in his eyes divine men and form a sacred society.¹⁰⁹ But it is his own view of the world and of life, which shows more than aught else how highly he esteemed the Greek philosophers. It agrees in the most essential points with the great teachers of the Greeks. Nay, Philo has so profoundly absorbed their doctrines and so peculiarly worked them up into a new whole, as himself to belong to the series of Greek philosophers. His system may on the whole be entitled an eclectic one, Platonic, Stoic, and Neo-Pythagorean doctrines being the most prominent. Just in proportion as now one now the other was embraced, has he been designated at one time a *Platonist*, at another a *Pythagorean*.¹¹⁰ He might just as correctly be called a Stoic, for the influence of Stoicism was at least as strong upon him as that of Platonism or Neo-Pythagoreanism.¹¹¹

Notwithstanding however this profound appropriation of

¹⁰⁷ A list of Greek classics quoted by Philo is given by Grossmann, *Quaestiones Philonae*, i. p. 5. Siegfried, *Philo*, p. 137 sqq.

¹⁰⁸ *De providentia*, ii. 42, p. 77, ed. Aucher (Richter, 8th small vol.). Comp. also *Quod omnis probus liber*, ii. 447, Mangey (Richter, 5th small vol.), where, according to the *cod. Mediceus* (one of the best manuscripts), τὸν ἐρώτατον Πλάτωνα is the reading instead of τὸν λιγυρότατον Πλάτωνα.

¹⁰⁹ *De providentia*, ii. 48, p. 79, ed. Aucher (Richter, 8th small vol.): Parmenides, Empedocles, Zeno, Cleanthes alique divi homines ac velut verus quidam proprieque sacer coetus. Comp. *Quod omnis probus liber*, ii. 444, Mang. (Richter, 5th small vol.): τὸν τῶν Πυθαγορείων ἐρώτατον θίασον.

¹¹⁰ A Platonist in the well-known proverb: ἡ Πλάτων φιλονίζει ἢ Φίλων πλατωνίζει (Hieronimus, *vir. illustr.* c. 11. Suidas, *Lex.* s.v. Φίλων. Photius, *Bibliotheca cod.* 105). Clemens Alex. calls him a Pythagorean, and that in the two passages in which he is characterizing his philosophical tendency, *Strom.* i. 15. 72: διὰ πολλῶν ὁ Πυθαγόρειος ὑποδείκνυσαι Φίλων. *Strom.* ii. 19, 100: ὡς φησιν ὁ Πυθαγόρειος Φίλων. Eusebius brings forward both his Platonism and his Pythagoreanism, *H. E.* ii. 4. 3: μέλιστα τὴν κατὰ Πλάτωνα καὶ Πυθαγόραν ἐξηλακῶς ἀγωγήν.

¹¹¹ Zeller and Heinze in particular have pointed out the strong influence of Stoicism. Stein in opposition to them seeks to lay more stress on Platonism. But comp. Heinze, *Theol. Litztg.* 1877, 112 (in the discussion on Stein's *Geschichte des Platonismus*).

Greek philosophy, Philo remained a *Jew*: and the wisdom of the Greeks did not make him unfaithful to the religion of his fathers. Nor must his *Jewish education* be depreciated in presence of the philosophical culture, which certainly appears the more prominent.¹¹³ He was *not indeed fluent* in the *Hebrew tongue*, and he read the Old Testament exclusively in the Greek translation. Still he had a respectable knowledge of Hebrew, as is shown by his numerous etymologies, which indeed often appear absurd to us, but are in truth not worse than those of the Palestinian Rabbis.¹¹⁸ He had indeed no accurate knowledge of the Palestinian Halachah. But that he had a general acquaintance with it is proved, not only by a single decided intimation,¹¹⁴ but especially by his whole work *de specialibus legibus*.¹¹⁵ In the *Haggadic interpretation of Scripture* he was quite a master. For the whole of his allegorical commentary is with respect to form nothing else than a transference of the method of the Palestinian Midrash to the region of Hellenism. It is just by this means that Philo gains the possibility of showing, that his philosophical doctrine already exists in the Old Testament. Many close approximations are also found with respect to substance, though these are much slighter than the agreement in method.¹¹⁶ For his legendary embellishment of the life of Moses, Philo expressly appeals to the tradition of the *πρεσβύτεροι*, who “always combined oral tradition with what was read aloud.”¹¹⁷

¹¹³ Comp. Siegfried, pp. 142–159.

¹¹⁸ Comp. the collections of Vallarsi and Siegfried named above (note 108).

¹¹⁴ Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 7. 6 (from the first book of the *Hypothetica*). Philo having here given by way of example a series of commands, says there are also *μυρία ἄλλα ἐπὶ τούτοις, ὅσα καὶ ἐπὶ ἀγράφων ἰθὺν καὶ νομίμων, καὶ τοῖς νομίμοις αὐτοῖς.*

¹¹⁵ See above, p. 343, and Ritter's work, *Philo und die Halacha*, 1879, there named; also Siegfried, p. 145.

¹¹⁶ Comp. Siegfried, p. 145 sqq. Also much in Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (1851), especially pp. 190–200.

¹¹⁷ *Vita Mosis*, lib. i. § 1 (Mang. ii. 81): ‘Ἀλλ’ ἕγωγε . . . τὰ περὶ τὸν

Philo has nowhere given a systematic statement of his system. He has at most developed single points, such as the doctrine of the creation of the world with some degree of connection. As a rule he gives the ideas he has worked out, in conjunction with the text of the Old Testament. This is consistent with the *formal principle* of his whole theology, viz. the assumption of the absolute authority of the Mosaic law. The Thorah of Moses is to him, as to every Jew, the supreme, nay the sole and absolutely decisive authority: a perfect revelation of Divine wisdom. Every word written in Holy Scripture by Moses is a divine declaration.¹¹⁸ Hence no word in it is without definite meaning.¹¹⁹ The Scriptures also of the other prophets in conjunction with those of Moses contain Divine revelations. For all the prophets are God's interpreters, who makes use of them as instruments for the revelation of the Divine will.¹²⁰ With this formal principle

ἄνδρα μηνύσω, μαθὼν αὐτὰ καὶ ἐκ βίβλων τῶν ἱερῶν . . . καὶ παρὰ τινῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους πρεσβυτέρων. Τὰ γὰρ λεγόμενα τοῖς ἀναγινωσκομένοις αἰεὶ συνύφαινον.

¹¹⁸ *Vita Mosis*, ii. 163, ed. Mangey (Richter, 4th small vol.): Οὐκ ἀγνοῶ μὲν οὖν, ὥς πάντα εἰσὶ χρησμοὶ ὅσα ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις ἀναγέγραπται χρησθέντες δι' αὐτοῦ (scil. Μωϋσέως).

¹¹⁹ In *De profugis*, i. 554, Mangey (Richter, 3rd small vol.), we are told of Philo, that the expression θανάτῳ θανατοῦσθαι instead of the simple θανατοῦσθαι, Ex. xxi. 12, disquieted him, because he well knew, ὅτι περιττὸν ὄνομα σὺδὲν τίθησιν.—For other examples see *De Cherubim*, i. 149, Mangey (Richter, 1st small vol.). *De agricultura Noe*, i. 300, Mangey (Richter, 2nd small vol.).

¹²⁰ The extent of Philo's *Canon* cannot be defined as to details. It is quite certain, that the Thorah of Moses has in his view quite a different importance to the rest of Holy Scripture. But the latter also, i.e. the most important of the Nebiim and Kethubim, are quoted by him as prophetic and sacred writings. For further particulars see Gfrörer, i. 46 sqq. On the inspiration of the prophets see *De monarchia*, ii. 222, Mang. (Richter, 4th small vol.): προφήτης θεοφόρητος θεσπιεῖ καὶ προφητεύσει, λέγων μὲν οἰκείου οὐδέν· οὐδὲ γὰρ, εἰ λέγει, δύναται καταλαβεῖν ὅγε κατεχόμενος ὄντως καὶ ἐνθουσιῶν. "Ὅσα δὲ ἐνηχέεται, διελεύσεται καθάπερ ὑποβάλλοντος ἑτέρου. Ἑρμηνεῖς γάρ εἰσιν οἱ προφῆται θεοῦ καταχραμένον τοῖς ἐκείνων ὀργάνοις πρὸς δῆλωσιν ὧν αὐτὸν ἐβλήθη. Comp. also *De specialibus legibus*, ii. 343, Mangey (Richter, 5th small vol.). *Quis rerum divinarum heres*, i. 511, Mangey (Richter, 3rd small vol.). For more on Philo's doctrine of inspiration see Gfrörer, i. 54–68.

of the absolute authority of Holy Scripture and especially of the Mosaic law, is connected the further assumption that all true wisdom was actually contained just in this source of all knowledge. In other words, Philo deduces formally from the Old Testament all those philosophical doctrines which he had in fact appropriated from the Greek philosophers. Not in Plato, Pythagoras and Zeno, but above all in the writings of Moses, is to be found the deepest and most perfect instruction concerning things divine and human. In them was already comprised all that was good and true, which the Greek philosophers subsequently taught. Thus Moses is the true teacher of mankind, and it is from him—as Philo, like Aristobulus, presupposes—that the Greek philosophers derived their wisdom.¹²¹

The scientific means by which it was possible for Philo to adhere to and carry out these assumptions is *allegorical interpretation*.¹²² This was no invention of Philo, but one which had already been perfected and wielded by others.¹²³ Hence it was for him a quite self-evident process, which he nowhere thought it necessary to justify, although he occasionally extols its value and declares it indispensable. By the help of this process he was able to read out of the primitive history of Genesis those profound philosophical theories, especially in the department of Psychology and Ethic, which really grew up in the soil of Greek philosophy. The most external occurrences of scriptural history become in his hands mines of instruction concerning the supreme problems of human existence.

Only by means of this method could the *double mission* be in fact fulfilled which Philo saw allotted to him. He thus became to his Jewish co-religionists, with whom he shared the presupposition of the Divine authority of the Mosaic

¹²¹ So Heraclitus (*Leg. allegor.* i. 65, Mang., Richter, 1st small vol. *Quis rerum divinarum heres.* i. 503, Mang., Richter, 3rd small vol.). Zeno (*Quod omnis probus liber*, ii. 454, Mang., Richter, 5th small vol.).

¹²² Comp. Gfrörer, i. 68–113. Zeller, iii. 2. 346–352; and especially Siegfried, *Philo*, pp. 160–197.

¹²³ Zeller, iii. 2. 265 sg.

law, the medium of the philosophic culture of the Greeks; showing them, that Moses had taught just what appeared to him true and valuable in Greek philosophy. On the other hand he proved to the Greeks by the same means, that all the knowledge and intuition, for which they so highly esteemed their own philosophers, were already to be found in the writings of Moses. It was not they but Moses, who was both the best of lawgivers and the first and greatest of philosophers. These two tendencies are, it may be plainly perceived, the mainsprings of Philo's extensive literary activity. Being himself both *Jew* and *Greek* he desired to act upon both, to make the Jews Greeks and the Greeks Jews. His religious assumptions are in the first place those of Judaism with its belief in revelation. But these religious assumptions underwent a powerful and peculiar modification by the elements which he derived from the Greek philosophy. And as he combined both in himself, he desired to set up a propaganda on both sides.

No strictly completed *system of Philo* can in truth be spoken of. The elements, of which his view of the world is compounded, are too heterogeneous to form a strictly completed unity. Nevertheless his several views exhibit a connected whole, whose members mutually condition one another. In the following attempt to give a brief sketch of this whole, we shall leave out of consideration his specifically Jewish assumptions and confine ourselves to his philosophical views. The characteristic feature of his standpoint is just this, that his philosophy, *i.e.* his entire view of the world, may be completely stated without the necessity of mentioning any Jewish, particularistic notions. *His Judaism virtually consists in the formal claim, that the Jewish people are by reason of the Mosaic revelation in possession of the highest religious knowledge—one might almost say of the true religious illumination. In a material respect Greek views have gained the upper hand.* For even his theology is only so far Jewish as to insist on monotheism and on the worship of God apart

from images. In this however it stands in opposition only to the polytheism of the heathen *religions*, but not to the idea of God of Greek *philosophy*, which on the contrary Philo very closely follows. Thus his Judaism is already very powerfully modified. Moreover the specifically Jewish, *i.e.* the particularistic notions are embraced by him in a form which is tantamount to their denial. It is just this which makes it possible, entirely to disregard them in a sketch of his view of the world.¹²⁴—The following survey follows chiefly the excellent exposition of Zeller, certainly the best we now have.

1. *The Doctrine of God.*¹²⁵ The fundamental thought from which Philo starts, is that of the dualism of God and the world. God alone is good and perfect, the finite as such is imperfect. All determinations, which are adapted to finite existence, are therefore to be denied of God. He is eternal, unchangeable, simple, free, self-sufficing.¹²⁶ He is not only

¹²⁴ With regard to detail the following remarks may suffice. Philo firmly adheres to the *obligation of the Mosaic law*. But only because it is in his eyes the most perfect, just and reasonable, because its moral demands are always the purest, its social institutions the best and most humane, its religious ceremonies the most consistent with the Divine intelligence. In this sense it is that he exhibits it in his work *de specialibus legibus*. He also adheres to the *prerogative of the Jewish people*: the Jews are the privileged people of God (Gfrörer, i. 486 sq. Dähne, i. 428 sq.). But they owe their privileges to their own and their forefathers' virtues. God makes no distinction between men as such. Hence too the *Messianic promise*, *i.e.* the promise of earthly prosperity, to which also Philo adheres (see § 29), applies not to Israel according to the flesh, but to all who are converted from idolatry to the only true God (see especially *de execrationibus*, § 8, Mang. ii. 435). We see that Jewish particularism is here everywhere in course of dissolution. Judaism is on the contrary the best religion just because it is cosmopolitan (comp. below, note 179).

¹²⁵ Comp. Gfrörer, i. 113 sqq. Dähne, i. 114 sqq. Zeller, iii. 2, pp. 353–360.

¹²⁶ *Eternal*, αἰδιος, *De mundi opificio*, i. 3, Mang. (Richter, small vol 5); *De caritate*, ii. 386, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 5), and elsewhere. *Unchangeable*, ἀτρεπτος, *De Cherubim*, i. 142, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1); *Legum allegoriarum*, i. 53, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1), and the whole work *Quod deus sit immutabilis*, i. 272 sqq., Mang. (Richter, small vol. 2).—*Simple*, ἀπλοῦς, *Legum allegor.* i. 66, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1).—*Free*, *De*

free from human faults, but exalted above all human virtues, He is better than the good and the beautiful.¹²⁷ Nay, since every determination would be a limitation, He is devoid of qualities *ἄποιος*, without a *ποιότης*,¹²⁸ and thus His nature is undefinable. We can only say that He is, not what He is.¹²⁹—It is true that together with these purely negative definitions, which advance almost to an absence of attributes, is found also a series of positive assertions on the nature of God, by which assertions of the former kind are again abolished. This contradiction however is not to be wondered at. For the object of this assertion of an absence of attributes is merely to remove all limitation, all imperfection from God. And therefore Philo makes no difficulty in placing beside it the other assertion: that *all perfection is combined in God and derived from Him, He fills and comprises everything*.¹³⁰ All

somniis, i. 692, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 3).—*Self-sufficing*, *χορῶν οὐδενὸς τὸ παράπαν, ἑαυτῷ ἱκανός, αὐταρκέστατος ἑαυτῷ*, *Legum allegor.* i. 66, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1); *De mutatione nominum*, i. 582, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 3); *De fortitudine*, ii. 377, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 5).

¹²⁷ *De mundi opificio*, i. 2, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1): ὁ τῶν ὅλων νοῦς —εἰλικρινέστατος καὶ ἀκραιφνέστατος, κρείττων τε ἢ ἀρετῇ καὶ κρείττων ἢ ἰσιότημῃ καὶ κρείττων ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ καλόν.

¹²⁸ *Legum allegoriae*, i. 50, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1): ἄποιος—ὁ θεός.—*Ibid.* i. 53: ὁ γὰρ ἢ ποιότητα οἰόμενος ἔχειν τὸν θεὸν ἢ μὴ ἓνα εἶναι ἢ μὴ ἀγέννητον καὶ ἀφθαρτον ἢ μὴ ἀτρεπτον, ἑαυτὸν ἀδικεῖ οὐ θεόν.—*Quod deus sit immutabilis*, i. 281, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 2): God must be withdrawn from all determination (quality) (ἐκβιβάζειν—πάσης ποιότητος).

¹²⁹ *Vita Mosi*, ii. 92, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 4): Ὁ δὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον λέγει, Φησὶν, αὐτοῖς· Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν, ἵνα μαθόντες διαφορὰν ὄντος τε καὶ μὴ ὄντος προσαναδιδαχθῶσιν, ὥς οὐδὲν ὄνομα ἐπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ παράπαν κυριολογεῖται, ᾧ μόνῃ πρόσεστι τὸ εἶναι.—*Quod deus sit immutabilis*, i. 282, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 2): ὁ δ' ἄρα οὐδὲ τῷ νῷ καταληπτός, ὅτι μὴ κατὰ τὸ εἶναι μόνον. Ὑπαρξίς γάρ ἐστ' ὁ καταλαμβάνομεν αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ χωρὶς ὑπάρξεως οὐδέν.—*De mutatione nominum*, i. 580, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 3).—*De somniis*, i. 655, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 3).

¹³⁰ *Legum allegoriae*, i. 52, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1): τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἐπιδεῖ καὶ ἔρημα καὶ κενὰ ὄντα πληρῶν καὶ περιέχων, αὐτὸς ὢν οὐδενὸς ἄλλου περιεχόμενος, αἷς εἰς καὶ τὸ πᾶν αὐτὸς ὢν.—*Ibid.* i. 88, Mang.: Πάντα γὰρ πεπληρώκεν ὁ θεός, καὶ διὰ πάντων διεληλυθεν, καὶ κενὸν οὐδὲ ἔρημον ἀπολέλοιπεν ἑαυτοῦ.—*Ibid.* i. 97, Mang.—*De confusione linguarum*, i. 425 Mang. (Richter, small vol. 2).—*De migratione Abrahami*, i. 466,

perfection in the creature is derived solely and only from Him.¹⁸¹

2. *The Intermediate Beings.*¹⁸² God, as the absolutely Perfect, cannot enter into direct contact with matter. All contact therewith would defile Him.¹⁸³ An acting therefore of God upon the world and in the world is according to Philo only possible through the intervention of intermediate causes, of interposing powers who establish an intercourse between God and the world. For the more precise definition of these intermediate beings, four notions, suited to this purpose, offered themselves to Philo; two belonging to the philosophical, two to the religious region. These were the *Platonic* doctrine of *ideas*, the *Stoic* doctrine of *active causes*, the *Jewish* doctrine of *angels*, and the *Greek* doctrine of *daemons*. All these elements, but chiefly the Stoic doctrine of powers, were used by Philo in constructing his peculiar doctrine of intermediate beings. Before the creation of this world of the senses, he teaches, God created the spiritual types of all things.¹⁸⁴ These types or ideas must however be conceived of as active causes, as powers which bring disordered matter into order.¹⁸⁵ It is by means of these spiritual powers

Mang. (Richter, small vol. 2).—*De somniis*, i. 630, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 3).—Gfrörer, i. 123 sqq.—Dähne, i. 282 sqq.

¹⁸¹ *Legum alleg.* i. 44, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1): Παύεται γὰρ οὐδέποτε ποιῶν ὁ θεός, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἴδιον τὸ καλεῖν πυρὸς, καὶ χιόνος τὸ ψύχειν, οὕτω καὶ θεοῦ τὸ ποιεῖν· καὶ πολὺ γε μᾶλλον, ὅσα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀπασιν ἀρχὴ τοῦ δρᾶν ἀστίν.

¹⁸² Comp. Gfrörer, i. 143 sqq. Dähne, i. 161 sqq., 202 sqq. Zeller, iii. 2, pp. 360–370. Keferstein's above-named *Monograph*.

¹⁸³ *De victimas offerentibus*, ii. 261, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 4): 'Ἐξ ἐκείνης γὰρ [τῆς ὕλης] πάντ' ἐγέννησεν ὁ θεός, οὐκ ἐφαπτόμενος αὐτός· οὐ γὰρ ἦν θίμης ἀπείρου καὶ πεφυρμένης ὕλης ψαύειν τὸν ἴδιον καὶ μακάριον.

¹⁸⁴ *De mundi opificio*, i. 4, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1): Προλαβὼν γὰρ ὁ θεός ἅτε θεός, ὅτι μίμημα καλὸν οὐκ ἂν ποτε γένοιτο καλοῦ δίχα παραδείγματος, οὐδέ τι τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἀνυπαίτιον, ὃ μὴ πρὸς ἀρχέτυπον καὶ νοητὴν ἰδέαν ἀπεικονίσθη, βουλευθεὶς τὸν ὁρατὸν τουτοῦ κόσμου δημιουργῆσαι, προεξετύπου τὸν νοητὸν, ἵνα χρώμενος ἀσώματῳ καὶ θεοειδιστάτῳ παραδείγματι, τὸν σωματικὸν τοῦτον ἀπεργάσῃται, πρεσβυτέρου νεώτερον ἀπεικόνισμα, τὰ πάντα περιέξοντα αἰσθητὰ γένη, ὥσπερ ἐν ἐκείνῳ νοητά. Comp. the work *De mundi opificio*.

¹⁸⁵ *De victimas offerentibus*, ii. 261, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 4): ταῖς

that God acts in the world. They are His ministers and vicegerents, the ambassadors and mediums between God and things finite,¹⁸⁶ the *λόγοι* or partial powers of the universal reason.¹⁸⁷ By Moses they are called angels, by the Greeks daemons.¹⁸⁸ If according to this they appear to be conceived of as independent hypostases, nay as personal beings, other assertions again forbid us to take them for decidedly such. It is expressly said, that they exist only in the Divine thought.¹⁸⁹ They are designated as the infinite powers of the infinite God,¹⁴⁰ and thus regarded as an inseparable portion of the Divine existence. But it would again be a mistake, on the ground of these assertions to deny definitely the personification of the *λόγοι* or *δυνάμεις*. The truth is just this, that Philo conceived of them *both as independent hypostases and as immanent determinations of the Divine existence*. And it is an apt remark of Zeller's, that this contradiction is necessarily required by the premisses of Philo's system. "He combines both definitions without observing their contradiction, nay he

ἀσωμάτοις δυνάμειν, ὧν ἔτυμον ὄνομα αἱ ἰδέαι, κατεχρήσατο πρὸς τὸ γένος ἑκάστου τὴν ἀρμόττουσαν λαβεῖν μορφήν.—*De monarchia*, ii. 218 sq., Mang. (Richter, small vol. 4).

¹⁸⁶ *De Abrahamo*, ii. 17 sq., Mang. (Richter, small vol. 4): *ἰσραὴλ καὶ θεῖαι φύσεις, ὑποδίακονοι καὶ ὑπαρχοὶ τοῦ πρώτου θεοῦ.*—*De somniis*, i. 642, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 3).

¹⁸⁷ *Legum alleg.* i. 122, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1): *τοὺς ἀγγέλους καὶ λόγους αὐτοῦ.*—*De somniis*, i. 681, Mang. (Richter, 3): *τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ λόγους ἐπικουρίας ἕνεκα τῶν φιλαρέτων ἀποστέλλει.*—*Ibid.* i. 640: *ψυχαὶ δὲ εἰσιν ἀθάνατοι οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι.*—On the identity of the *λόγοι* with the ideas see Heinze, *Lehre vom Logos*, p. 220.

¹⁸⁸ *De somniis*, i. 638, Mang. (Richter, 3): *ἀθανάτοις λόγοις, οὓς καλεῖν ἴθος ἀγγέλους.*—*Ibid.* i. 642: *ταύτας (viz. pure souls) δαίμονας μὲν οἱ ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι, ὁ δὲ ἱερός λόγος ἀγγέλους εἶωθε καλεῖν.*—*De gigantibus*, i. 263, Mang. (Richter, 2): *Οὓς ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι δαίμονας, ἀγγέλους Μωϋσῆς εἶωθεν ὀνομάζειν.* *ψυχὰς δὲ εἰσι κατὰ τὸν αἶρα πετόμεναι.*

¹⁸⁹ *De mundi opificio*, i. 4, Mang. (Richter, 1): *As the ideal city, whose plan the artist sketches, exists only in his mind, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον οὐδὲ ὁ ἐκ τῶν ἰδεῶν κόσμος ἄλλον ἂν ἔχει τόπον ἢ τὸν θεῖον λόγον τὸν ταῦτα διακοσμήσαντα.*—*Ibid.* i. 5, Mang.: *Εἰ δὲ τις ἐβελήσεις γυμνοτέροις χρήσασθαι τοῖς ὀνόμασιν, οὐδὲν ἂν ἕτερον εἴποι τὸν νοητὸν εἶναι κόσμον, ἢ θεοῦ λόγον ἤδη κοσμοποιούντος.*

¹⁴⁰ *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, i. 173, Mang. (Richter, 1): *ἀπερίγραφοι γὰρ ὁ θεός, ἀπερίγραφοι καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ.*

is unable to observe it, because otherwise the intermediary rôle assigned to the Divine powers would be forfeited, even that double nature, by reason of which they are on the one hand to be identical with God, that a participation in the Deity may by their means be possible to the finite, and on the other hand different from Him, that the Deity, notwithstanding this participation, may remain apart from all contact with the world.”¹⁴¹

With this ambiguous view of the nature of the *δυνάμεις*, the question as to their origin must also necessarily remain undecided. It is true that Philo frequently expresses himself in an emanistic sense. But yet he never distinctly formulates the doctrine of emanation.¹⁴² The number of the *δυνάμεις* is in itself unlimited.¹⁴³ Yet Philo sometimes gives calculations, when comprising the individual powers under certain notions of species.¹⁴⁴ He mostly distinguishes two supreme powers: *goodness* and *might*,¹⁴⁵ which again are combined and reconciled by the Divine *Logos*, which, so far as it is reckoned among the powers at all, is the chief of all, the root from which the rest proceed, the most universal intermediary between God and the world, that in which are comprised all the operations of God.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴¹ *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2, p. 365.

¹⁴² Comp. Zeller, pp. 366–369.—*Emanistic*, e.g. *De profugis*, i. 575, Mang. (Richter, 3): God is ἡ πρεσβυτάτη πηγή. Καὶ μήποτε' εἰκότως. Τὸν γὰρ σύμπαντα τοῦτον κόσμον ὠμβρησε.—Also *De somniis*, i. 688, Mang. (Richter, 3).

¹⁴³ *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, i. 173, Mang. (Richter, 1): ἀπερίγραφοι αἱ δυνάμεις.—*De confusione linguarum*, i. 431, Mang. (Richter, 2): Εἰς ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἀμυθῆτους περὶ αὐτὸν ἔχει δυνάμεις.

¹⁴⁴ In *de profugis*, i. 560, Mang. (Richter, 3), he counts in all six, viz. besides the θεῖος λόγος the five following: ἡ ποιητική, ἡ βασιλική, ἡ ἰλεως, ἡ νομοθετική, . . . (the last is wanting).

¹⁴⁵ Ἀγαθότης and ἀρχή (*De Cherubim*, i. 144, Mang., Richter, 1; *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, i. 173, Mang., Richter, 1), εὐεργεσία and ἡγεμονία, or ἡ χαριστική and ἡ βασιλική (both *de somniis*, i. 645, Mang., Richter, 3), ἡ εὐεργέτης and ἡ κολαστήριος (*de victimas offerentibus*, ii. 258, Mang., Richter, 4), also ἡ ποιητική and ἡ βασιλική (because God created the world in consequence of His goodness, so *de Abrahamo*, ii. 19, Mang., Richter, 4. *Vita Mosis*, ii. 150, Mang., Richter, 4).

¹⁴⁶ *De profugis*, i. 560, Mang. (Richter, 3). *Quaest. in Exod.* ii. 68, p. 514 sq. (Richter, 7). Contrary to Zeller, who attempts to understand

3. *The Logos.*¹⁴⁷ "By the Logos Philo understands *the power of God or the active Divine intelligence in general*; he designates it as the idea which comprises all other ideas, the power which comprises all powers in itself, as the entirety of the supersensuous world or of the Divine powers."¹⁴⁸ It is neither uncreated nor created after the manner of finite things.¹⁴⁹ It is the vicegerent and ambassador of God;¹⁵⁰ the angel or archangel which delivers to us the revelations of God;¹⁵¹ the instrument by which God made the world.¹⁵² The Logos is thus identified with the creative word of God.¹⁵³ But not only is it the mediator for the relations of God to the world, but also for the relations of the world to God. The Logos is the High Priest, who makes intercession for the world to God.¹⁵⁴ But notwithstanding this apparently undoubted personification of the Logos, what has been said above of the Divine powers in general applies here also. "The definitions, which, according to the presuppositions of our thought, would

certain passages as saying, that the Logos is to be conceived of not as the root, but as the product or result of the two supreme powers (p. 370); see Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos*, p. 248 sqq.

¹⁴⁷ Comp. Gfrörer, i. 168–326. Dähne, i. 202 sqq. Zeller, iii. 2, pp. 370–386, and the above-named *Monographs*, especially those of Heinze and Soulier.

¹⁴⁸ Zeller, iii. 2, p. 371.

¹⁴⁹ *Quis rerum divinarum heres.* i. 501 sq., Mang. (Richter, 3): οὔτε ἀγέννητος ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἦν, οὔτε γεννητὸς ὡς ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ μέσος τῶν ἀκρων, ἀμφοτέροις ὁμωρεῦν.

¹⁵⁰ *Quis rer. div. her. l.c.*: πρεσβυτῆς τοῦ ἡγεμόνος πρὸς τὸ ὑπήκοον.

¹⁵¹ *Leg. allegor.* i. 122, Mang. (Richter, 1): τὸν ἄγγελον, ὃς ἐστὶ λόγος. —*De confusione linguarum*, i. 427, Mang. (Richter, 2): τὸν πρωτόγονον αὐτοῦ λόγον, τὸν ἄγγελον πρεσβύτατον, ὡς ἀρχάγγελον πολυάνυμον ὑπάρχοντα. —*De somniis*, i. 656, Mang. (Richter, 3). —*Quis rer. div. her.* i. 501, *fin.* (Richter, 3). —*Quaest. in Exod.* ii. 18, p. 476 (Richter, 7).

¹⁵² *Leg. allegor.* i. 106, Mang. *fin.* (Richter, 1): Σκια θεοῦ δὲ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἐστίν, ᾧ καθάπερ ὄργανον προσχρησάμενος ἰσομοιοῖται. —*De Cherubim*, i. 162, Mang. (Richter, 1): Εὐρήσεις γὰρ αἵτιον μὲν αὐτοῦ [τοῦ κόσμου] τὸν θεόν, ὃς οὐ γίγνεται ἕλην δὲ τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα, ἐξ ὧν συνεκράθη ὄργανον τοῦ λόγον θεοῦ, δι' οὗ κατεσκευάσθη τῆς δὲ κατασκευῆς αἰτίαν τὴν ἀγαθότητα τοῦ δημιουργοῦ.

¹⁵³ *Leg. alleg.* i. 47, Mang. (Richter, 1). *De sacrific. Abel et Cain.* i. 165, Mang. (Richter, 1). Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos*, p. 280.

¹⁵⁴ *De aigentibus.* i. 269, Mang. *fin.* (Richter, 2): ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς λόγος ἐνδια-

require the personality of the Logos, are crossed in Philo by such as make it impossible, and the peculiarity of his mode of conception consists in his not perceiving the contradiction involved in making the idea of the Logos oscillate obscurely between personal and impersonal being. This peculiarity is equally misunderstood, when Philo's Logos is regarded absolutely as a person separate from God, and when on the contrary it is supposed that it only denotes God under a definite relation, according to the aspect of His activity. According to Philo's opinion the Logos is both, but for this very reason neither one nor the other exclusively; and he does not perceive, that it is impossible to combine these definitions into one notion."¹⁵⁵

"But Philo cannot dispense with these definitions. With him the Logos, like all the Divine powers, is only necessary, because the supreme God Himself can enter into no direct contact with the finite; it must stand between the two and be the medium of their mutual relation; and how can it be this unless it were different from both, if it were only a certain Divine property? In this case we should have again that direct action of God upon finite things, which Philo declares inadmissible. On the other hand the Logos must now indeed be again identical with each of the opposites which it was to reconcile, it must likewise be a property of God as a power operative in the world. Philo could not without contradiction succeed in combining the two."¹⁵⁶

Philo was, as it seems, the first to postulate, under the name of the Logos, such an intermediate being between God

τρίβειν αἰὲ καὶ σχολάζειν ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις δόμασι δυνάμενος.—*De migratione Abrahami*, i. 452, Mang. (Richter, 2): τὸν ἀρχιερέα λόγον.—*De profugis*, i. 562, Mang. (Richter, 3): λέγομεν γάρ, τὸν ἀρχιερέα οὐκ ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ λόγον θεῶν εἶναι, πάντων οὐχ ἐκουσίῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκουσίῳ ἀδικημάτων ἀμέτοχον.—*Quis rer. div. her.* i. 501, Mang. *fin.* (Richter, 3): 'Ο δ' αὐτὸς ἰκέτης μὲν ἐστὶ τοῦ θνητοῦ κηραίνοντος αἰὲ πρὸς τὸ ἀφθαρτον.—*Vita Mosis*, ii. 155, Mang. (Richter, 4): 'Αναγκαῖον γάρ ἦν τὸν ἱερωμένον τῷ τοῦ κόσμου πατρὶ παρακλήτῳ χρῆσθαι τελειοτάτῳ τὴν ἀρετὴν υἱῷ, πρὸς τε ἀμνηστείαν ἀμαρτημάτων καὶ χορηγίαν ἀφθονωτάτων ἀγαθῶν.

¹⁵⁵ Zeller, iii. 2, p. 378.

¹⁵⁶ Zeller, iii. 2, p. 380 sq.

and the world.¹⁵⁷ Points of contact for his doctrine lay in both Jewish theology and Greek philosophy. In the former it was chiefly the doctrine of the *wisdom* of God, and in the second place, that of the *Spirit* and the *Word* of God, which Philo took up. From the Platonic philosophy it was the doctrine of ideas and of the soul of the world, which he utilized for his purpose. But it is the Stoic doctrine of the Deity as the active reason of the world, which is the nearest to his. "We need only to strip off from this Stoic doctrine of the Logos, its pantheistic element, by distinguishing the Logos from the Deity, and its materialistic element by distinguishing it from organized matter, to have the Philonian Logos complete."¹⁵⁸

4. *The creation and preservation of the world.*¹⁵⁹ All existence cannot however, the intermediate beings notwithstanding, be traced back to God. For the evil, the imperfect can in no wise, not even indirectly, have its cause in God.¹⁶⁰ It originates from a second principle, from matter (ἕλη, or stoically οὐσ(α)). This is the formless, lifeless, unmoved, unordered mass devoid of properties, from which God, by means of the Logos and the divine powers, formed the world.¹⁶¹ For only

¹⁵⁷ In the Wisdom of Solomon the Divine word is certainly once personified as elsewhere wisdom is. But this is merely a poetical personification, not an actual hypostatification. The author applies the term *Wisdom of God* to represent the notion of an intermediary hypostasis, so far as he entertains it. Comp. also Grimm on the passage. In the Targums the "word of God" (Memra) certainly plays a rôle similar to that of the Logos in Philo. But these were very probably already under his influence.

¹⁵⁸ Zeller, iii. 2, p. 385.

¹⁵⁹ Comp. Gfrörer, i. 327 sqq. Dähne, i. 170 sqq., 246 sqq. Zeller, iii. 2, pp. 386-393.

¹⁶⁰ Comp. Zeller, iii. 3, p. 386, note 1.

¹⁶¹ *De mundi opificio*, i. 5, Mang. (Richter, 1): Matter is ἐξ ἑαυτῆς ἀτακτος, ἀποιος, ἀψυχος, ἑτεροποιότητος, ἀναρμωστίας, ἀσυμφωνίας μεστή.—*Quis rerum divinarum heres*. i. 492, Mang. fin. (Richter, 3): τήν τε ἀμορφον καὶ ἀποιον τῶν ὅλων οὐσίαν.—*De profugis*, i. 547, Mang. (Richter, 3): τήν ἀποιον καὶ ἀνείδεον καὶ ἀσχημάτιστον οὐσίαν.—*Ibid.*: ἡ ἀποιος ἕλη.—*De victimas offerentibus*, ii. 261, Mang. (Richter, 4): ἀμορφος ἕλη.—*Ibid.*: ἀπείρου καὶ πεφυρμένης ἕλης.—*De creatione principum*, ii. 367, Mang.

a forming of the world and not creation in its proper sense is spoken of in Philo, since the origin of matter is not in God, but it is placed as a second principle beside Him. And the preservation of the world as well as its formation is effected by means of the Logos and the Divine powers. Nay the former is in truth but a continuation of the latter; and what we call the laws of nature are but the totality of the regular Divine operations.¹⁶²

5. *Anthropology*.¹⁶³ It is in anthropology, where Philo chiefly follows the Platonic doctrine, that the dualistic basis of his system comes most strongly to light. Philo here starts from the assumption, that the entire atmosphere is filled with souls. Of these it is the angels or demons dwelling in its higher parts who are the mediums of God's intercourse with the world.¹⁶⁴ Those on the contrary who remain nearer to the earth, are attracted by sense and descend into mortal bodies.¹⁶⁵ Consequently the soul of man is nothing else than one of those Divine powers, of those emanations of Deity, which in their original state are called angels or daemons. It is only the life-sustaining, sensitive soul that originates by generation, and indeed from the aeriform elements of the seed; reason on the contrary enters into man from without.¹⁶⁶ The

(Richter, 5): Μηνύει δ' ἡ τοῦ κόσμου γένεσις τε καὶ διοικήσις. Τὰ γὰρ μὴ ὄντα ἐκάλεσεν εἰς τὸ εἶναι, τάξιν ἐξ ἀταξίας, καὶ ἐξ ἀποίων ποιότητας, καὶ ἐξ ἀνομοίων ὁμοιότητας, καὶ ἐξ ἑτεροτήτων ταυτότητας, καὶ ἐξ ἀκοινωνήτων καὶ ἀναρμόστων κοινωνίας καὶ ἁρμονίας, καὶ ἐκ μὲν ἀνισότητος ἰσότητα, ἐκ δὲ σκότους φῶς ἐργασάμενος. Ἄει γάρ ἐστιν ἐπιμελὲς αὐτῷ καὶ ταῖς εὐεργέτισιν αὐτοῦ δυνάμεισι τὸ πλημμελὲς τῆς χείρονος οὐσίας μεταποιεῖν καὶ μεθαρμόζεσθαι πρὸς τὴν ἀμείνω.

¹⁶² Comp. Zeller, iii. 2, p. 389 sq.

¹⁶³ Comp. Gfrörer, i. 373-415. Dähne, i. 288-340. Zeller, iii. 2, pp. 393-402.

¹⁶⁴ *De somniis*, i. 642, Mang. (Richter, 3).

¹⁶⁵ *De gigantibus*, i. 263 sq., Mang. (Richter, 2).

¹⁶⁶ *De mundi opificio*, i. 15, Mang. (Richter, 1): Ἡ δὲ [ἡ κίνησις] οἷα τεχνίτης, ἡ κυριώτερον εἰπεῖν, ἀνεπίληπτος τέχνη, ζωπλαστεῖ τὴν μὲν ὑγρὰν οὐσίαν εἰς τὰ τοῦ σώματος μέλη καὶ μέρη διανέμουσα, τὴν δὲ πνευματικὴν εἰς τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεις, τὴν τε θρεπτικὴν καὶ τὴν αἰσθητικὴν. Τὴν γὰρ τοῦ λογισμοῦ ταυτὴν ὑπερθετέον, διὰ τοὺς φάσκοντας θύραθεν αὐτὸν ἐπεισεῖναι, θεῖον καὶ αἰδῖον ὄντα.

human *πνεῦμα* is thus an emanation of Deity: God breathed *His* spirit into man.¹⁶⁷—The body as the animal part of man is the source of all evil, it is the prison to which the spirit is banished,¹⁶⁸ the corpse which the soul drags about with it,¹⁶⁹ the coffin or the grave, from which it will first awake to true life.¹⁷⁰ Sense as such being evil, sin is innate in man.¹⁷¹ No one can keep himself free from it, even if he were to live but a day.¹⁷²

6. *Ethic.*¹⁷³ According to these anthropologic assumptions it is self-evident, that the chief principle of ethic is the *utmost possible renunciation of sensuousness*, the extirpation of desire and of the passions. Hence among philosophical systems, the Stoic must be most of all congenial to Philo in the matter of ethic. It is this that he chiefly embraces, not only in its fundamental thought of the mortification of the senses, but also in single statements, as in the doctrine of the four cardinal virtues¹⁷⁴ and of the four passions.¹⁷⁵ Like the Stoics he teaches, that there

¹⁶⁷ *Quod deterius potiori insidiatur*, i. 206 sq., Mang. (Richter, 1).—*De mundi opificio*, i. 32, Mang. (Richter, 1).—*De specialibus legibus*, ii. 356, Mang. (Richter, 5).—*Quis rerum divinarum heres*, i. 480 sq., 498 sq., Mang. (Richter, 3).

¹⁶⁸ *Δεσπωτήριον*, *De ebrietate*, i. 372, *fin.*, Mang. (Richter, 2). *Leg. allegor.* i. 95, *sub fin.*, Mang. (Richter, 1). *De migratione Abrahami*, i. 437, *sub fin.*, Mang. (Richter, 2).

¹⁶⁹ *Νεκρὸν σῶμα*, *Leg. allegor.* i. 100 sq., Mang. (Richter, 1). *De gigantibus*, i. 264, *med.* Mang. (Richter, 2). *Τὸν ψυχῆς ἔγγιστα οἶκον, ὃν ἀπὸ γενέσεως ἀχρι τελευτῆς, ἀχθος τοσοῦτον, οὐκ ἀποτίθεται νεκροφοροῦσα*, *De Agricultura Noe*, i. 305, Mang. (Richter, 2).

¹⁷⁰ *Λάρναξ ἢ σορός*, *De migratione Abrahami*, i. 438, *sub fin.*, Mang. (Richter, 2).—*σῆμα*, *Leg. allegor.* i. 65, *sub fin.*, Mang. (Richter, 1).

¹⁷¹ *Vita Moïsis*, ii. 157, Mang. (Richter, 4): *παντὶ γεννητῷ καὶ ἀνσπουδαίῳ ᾧ, παρ' ὅσον ἦλθεν εἰς γένεσιν, συμφυὲς τὸ ἀμαρτάνον ἐστίν.*

¹⁷² *De mutatione nominum*, i. 585, Mang. (Richter, 3): *Τίς γὰρ, ὡς ὁ Ἰώβ φησι, καθαρὸς ἀπὸ βύπτου, καὶ ἀν μίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ ἐστὶν ἡ ζωὴ* (*Job xiv. 4 sq.*).

¹⁷³ *Comp. Gfrörer*, i. 415 sqq. *Dähne*, i. 341–423. *Zeller*, iii. 2, pp. 402–416. Frankel in the above-cited article. *Kähler*, *Das Gewissen*, i. 1 (1878), p. 171 sqq.

¹⁷⁴ *Φρόνησις, σωφροσύνη, ἀνδρεία, δικαιοσύνη*, *Leg. allegor.* i. 56, Mang. (Richter, 1), and frequently.

¹⁷⁵ *Leg. allegor.* i. 114, *sub fin.*, Mang. (Richter, 1).

is only one good, morality; ¹⁷⁶ like them he requires freedom from all passions, ¹⁷⁷ and the greatest possible simplicity of life; ¹⁷⁸ like them he also is a cosmopolitan. ¹⁷⁹ But with all this affinity Philo's ethic still essentially differs from the Stoic. The Stoics refer man to his own strength; according to Philo, man, as a sensuous being, is incapable of liberating himself from sensuousness: for this he needs the help of God. It is God who plants and promotes the virtues in the soul of man. Only he, who honours Him and yields himself to His influence, can attain to perfection. ¹⁸⁰ True morality is, as Plato teaches, the imitation of the Deity. ¹⁸¹ In this religious basis of ethic Philo is very decidedly distinguished from the Stoics. Political activity, and practical morality in general, have a value only so far as they are a necessary medium for contending against evil. ¹⁸² But knowledge also must subserve this one object, and hence ethic is the most important part of philosophy. ¹⁸³ Nevertheless the purity of

¹⁷⁶ Μόνον εἶναι τὸ καλὸν ἀγαθόν, *De posteritate Caini*, i. 251, *init.*, Mang. (Richter, 2).

¹⁷⁷ *Leg. allegor.* i. 100, Mang. (Richter, 1): Ο μὲν δῆρις, ἡ ἡδονή, ἐξ ἑαυτῆς ἐστὶ μοχθηρά. Διὰ τοῦτο ἐν μὲν σπουδαίῳ οὐκ εὐρίσκεται τὸ παράπαν, μόνος δὲ αὐτῆς ὁ Φαῦλος ἀπολαύει.—*Ibid.* i. 113, *init.*: Μωϋσῆς δὲ ὅλον τὸν θυμὸν ἐκτέμνειν καὶ ἀποκόπτειν οἶεται δεῖν τῆς ψυχῆς, αὐ μετριοπάθειαν, ἀλλὰ συνόλως ἀπάθειαν ἀγαπᾶν.

¹⁷⁸ *De somniis*, i. 639–665, Mang. (Richter, 3).—*Leg. allegor.* i. 115, Mang. (Richter, 1).—*Quod deterius potiori insidiatur*, i. 198, *init.*, Mang. (Richter, 1).

¹⁷⁹ See Zeller, iii. 2, p. 404.

¹⁸⁰ *Leg. allegor.* i. 53, *init.*, Mang. (Richter, 1): πρέπει τῷ θεῷ φυτεύειν καὶ οἰκοδομεῖν ἐν ψυχῇ τὰς ἀρετάς.—*Ibid.* i. 60: "Όταν ἐκβῇ ὁ νοῦς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἀνεύγκη θεῷ, ὥσπερ ὁ γέλως Ἰσαάκ, τηλικαῦτα ὁμολογίαν τὴν πρὸς τὸν ὄντα ποιεῖται. "Εως δὲ αὐτὸν ὑποτίθεται ὡς αἰτίον τινος, μακρὰν ἀφέστηκε τοῦ παραχωρεῖν θεῷ καὶ ὁμολογεῖν αὐτῷ. Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι νοητέον, ὅτι ἔργον ἐστὶν οὐχὶ τῆς ψυχῆς, ἀλλὰ τοῦ φαίνοντος αὐτῇ θεοῦ τὸ εὐχάριστον.—*Ibid.* i. 131: αὐτὸς γὰρ [ὁ κύριος] πατήρ ἐστι τῆς τελείας φύσεως, σπείρων ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς καὶ γεννᾶν τὸ εὐδαιμονεῖν.

¹⁸¹ *De mundi opificio*, i. 35, *init.*, Mang. (Richter, 1).—*De decalogo*, ii. 193, *init.*, Mang. (Richter, 4).—*De caritate*, ii. 404, *init.*, Mang. (Richter, 5).—*De migratione Abrahami*, i. 456, *med.* 463, Mang. (Richter, 2).

¹⁸² See Zeller, iii. 2, p. 406 sq.

¹⁸³ *De mutatione nominum*, i. 589, Mang. (Richter, 3): Καθάπερ δένδρων

life attained by such self-knowledge is not the ultimate and supreme object of human development. On the contrary the origin of man being transcendental, the object of his development is likewise transcendental. As it was by falling away from God that he was entangled in this life of sense, so must he struggle up from it to the direct *vision of God*. This object is attainable even in this earthly life. For the truly wise and virtuous man is lifted above and out of himself, and in such ecstasy beholds and recognises Deity itself. His own consciousness sinks and disappears in the Divine light; and the Spirit of God dwells in him and stirs him like the strings of a musical instrument.¹⁸⁴ He, who has in this way attained to the vision of the Divine, has reached the highest degree of earthly happiness. Beyond it lies only complete deliverance from this body, that return of the soul to its original incorporeal condition, which is bestowed on those who have kept themselves free from attachment to this sensuous body.¹⁸⁵

οὐδὲν ὄφελος, εἰ μὴ καρπῶν οἰστικά γένοιτο, τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον οὐδὲν φυσιο-
λογίας, εἰ μὴ μέλλοι κτήσιν ἀρετῆς ἐνεγκεῖν κ.τ.λ.—*De agricultura Noe*, i.
302, Mang. (Richter, 2). In both passages Philo compares physics to the
plants and trees; logic to the hedges and fences; ethic to the fruits. He
praises the Essenes for exclusively occupying themselves with ethic (*Quod
omnis probus liber*, ii. 458, Mang.).

¹⁸⁴ Philo thus addresses the soul in *Quis rerum divinarum heres*. i. 482,
Mang. (Richter, 3): σαυτὴν ἀποδραθὶ καὶ ἔκσκηθι σεαυτῆς, καθάπερ οἱ κορυβαν-
τιῶντες καὶ κατεχόμενοι, βακχευθεῖσα καὶ θεοφορηθεῖσα κατὰ τινα προφητικὸν
ἐπιθειασμόν. Ἐνθουσιώσης γὰρ καὶ οὐκ ἔτι οὔσης ἐν ἑαυτῇ διανοίας, ἀλλ' ἔρωτ
οὐρανίῳ σεσοβημένης καὶ ἐκμεμηνυίας κ.τ.λ. *Quis rerum divinarum heres*. i.
508 sqq., Mang. (Richter, 3), especially i. 511 (where Philo dilates at
length upon the ecstatic state).

¹⁸⁵ *De Abrahamo*, ii. 37, Mang. (Richter, 4): Wisdom teaches, τὸν
θάνατον νομίζειν μὴ σβέσειν ψυχῆς, ἀλλὰ χωρισμὸν καὶ διάζευξιν ἀπὸ σώματος,
ὅθεν ἦλθεν ἀπιούσης. Ἦλθε δὲ, ὡς ἐν τῇ κοσμοποιίᾳ δεδήλωται, παρὰ θεοῦ.—
Leg. allegor. i. 65 (Richter, 1): Εὖ καὶ ὁ Ἡράκλειτος κατὰ τοῦτο Μωϋσέως
ἀκολουθήσας τῷ δόγματι· Φησὶ γὰρ “Ζῶμεν τὸν ἐκείνων θάνατον, τεθνήκαμεν
δὲ τὸν ἐκείνων βίον,” ὡς νῦν μὲν, ὅτε ἐνζῶμεν, τεθνηκυίας τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ ὡς ἂν
ἐν σήματι τῷ σώματι ἐντετευμβευμένης· εἰ δὲ ἀποθάνοιμεν, τῆς ψυχῆς ζώσης τὸν
ἴδιον βίον, καὶ ἀππηλαγμένης κακοῦ καὶ νεκροῦ τοῦ συνδέτου σώματος. For
those who have not freed themselves from sense, Philo has to accept, after
the occurrence of natural death, a transition to another body, that is a
transmigration of souls. See Zeller, iii. 2. 397

Philo's influence upon the two circles, which he had chiefly in view, viz. Judaism and heathenism, was impaired by the fact, that from his time onward Jewish Hellenism in general gradually lost in importance. On the one hand, the Pharisaic tendency gained strength in the Dispersion also, on the other Hellenistic Judaism was, in respect of its influence upon heathen circles, repressed, nay altogether dissolved by Christianity, which was now in its prime. Hence Judæo-Hellenistic philosophy had gradually to give place to its stronger rival in both regions. Its influence was nevertheless still considerable. Jewish Rabbis and heathen neo-Platonists were more or less affected by it. Its strongest and most enduring influence was however exercised, in a direction which still lay outside Philo's horizon, upon the development of Christian dogma. The New Testament already shows unmistakeable traces of Philonean wisdom; and almost all the Greek Fathers of the first century, the apologists as well as the Alexandrians, the Gnostics as well as their adversaries, and even the great Greek theologians of subsequent centuries have, some more some less, either directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously drawn from Philo. But to follow out these traces lies beyond the province of this work.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁶ Compare on the history of Philo's influence, Siegfried, *Philo*, pp. 273-399.

103802
THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

ERRATA.

VOL. I.

- P. 2, l. 16, after *population* read *Lastly the Samaritans also must in a wider sense be reckoned as belonging to the Jewish population*
P. 3, l. 9, for *scribes and Pharisees* read *Pharisaic scribes*; and after l. 9, *chief seat* read *down to the destruction of the Holy City*
P. 4, l. 5, for *a century* read *centuries*
P. 4, note, for *fundamental* read *legal*?
P. 5, l. 2, for *grandson* read *grandsons*
P. 5, l. 5, after *caves* insert (*ἱσφωλίωσι*)
P. 5, note 14, l. 5 from foot, for *Articles in the Kunde des Morgenlandes* read *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*
P. 5, note 14, l. 3 from foot, for *Recess* read *Reuss*
P. 8, note 25, for *Sadducees* read *Sadducean women*, and for *Samaritans* read *Samaritan women*
P. 9, note 26, l. 1, for *Zung* read *Zunz*
P. 10, l. 7, for *It was read aloud*, etc. read *The Holy Scriptures were read aloud in it before as afterwards*
P. 12, last line, for *other than Grecian deities* read *other Grecian deities*
P. 42, last line, for *Kürbis* read *pumpkins*
P. 44, line 2, for *paragandion* read *paragaudion*
P. 47, l. 6, for *Alexander* read *Menelaus*
P. 50, l. 10, for *R. Tomael* read *R. Ismael*
P. 64, last line, for *when* read *When*
P. 65, l. 17, for *a position of exemption from taxes* read *an exempt position*
P. 68, l. 1, for *hence* read *never*
P. 74, l. 7, after *Majuma Ascalonis* insert (*the port of Ascalon*)
P. 76, l. 11, for 1500 read 2500
P. 81, l. 17, for *then* read *afterwards*
P. 95, l. 5, for *thus* read *then*
P. 95, l. 2 from foot, after *important towns* insert (*as Kanatha, Gerasa, Philadelphia*)
P. 100, l. 11, for *Vita 9: ἱμ.* read *Vita 9. 'Εμ.*
P. 117, l. 12, after *in the district of Gerasa* insert (*ἰν τοῖς Γερασσηνῶν ὁρίσιν*)
P. 128, l. 11, for *Perdiecas* read *Perdiccas*
P. 128, l. 9, for *one* read *our*
P. 334, l. 2, bottom, for *No. 4* read *No. IV.*
P. 343, l. 17, for *Artabanus* read *Artapanus*
P. 358, top line, for *them* read *these*

VOL. II.

- P. 14, l. 10, bottom, for *faith* read *fate*
P. 49, l. 7, for *legal decisions* read *legal appointments*
P. 134, last word, for *its* read *their*
P. 166, for *fourth book of Esdras* read *fourth book of Ezra*
P. 195, l. 2, bottom, for *ministration* read *administration*
P. 205, l. 3, bottom, for *Chasidaic* read *Chasidaic*
P. 239, l. 5, for *Capeno* read *Capena*

[Faint, illegible handwritten text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

11. 11. 77

[Faint, illegible handwritten notes or signatures.]

886

717 99

DS Schürer, Emil, 1844-1910. A history of the
122 Jewish people in the time of Jesus Christ.
S3913 [1924] (Card 2)
1924

v. 3-5

January 1924".

Translation of Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes
im Zeitalter Jesu Christi.

Includes bibliographies.

Contents.- 1st div., v.1-2. Political history
of Palestine, from B.C.175 to A.D.135.- 2d div.
v.1-3. The internal condition of Palestine, a

~~103802~~
(Continued on next

103802

